

MARY C. SULLIVAN

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A PLATFORM FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF
ISSUES IN THE FIELD OF RELIGION AND
THEIR BEARING ON EDUCATION

SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER 1953



RELIGIOUS EDUCATION — PROTESTANT, CATHOLIC, JEWISH
A Symposium

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS
A Syllabus

Religious Education

Official Publication of the Religious Education Association

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without any official endorsement. Articles in Religious Education are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$5.00 or more per year.
Single copies of Religious Education, \$1.00 each.

HERMAN E. WORNOM, General Secretary
545 West 111th Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Editor
Oberlin College,
Oberlin, Ohio

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Dean and Professor of Religious Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Chairman.

EDNA L. ACHESON, First Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

ALVIN J. COOPER, Board of Education, United Church of Canada, Toronto.

EMMA FRANK, Librarian, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

WALTER M. HORTON, Professor of Systematic Theology, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

THOMAS S. KEPLER, Professor of New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

HERBERT G. MAY, Professor of Old Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

GERARD S. SLOYAN, Department of Religious Education, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

The Religious Education Association

General Secretary and Business Office, 545 W. 111th Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

Editorial and Publication Office, 29 N. Pleasant St., Oberlin, Ohio
Printed at 48 S. Main Street, Oberlin, Ohio
Published bi-monthly. Printed in the U. S. A.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XLVIII

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1953

NUMBER 5

CONTENTS

	Page
The Program and Personnel of the Golden Anniversary Convention	<i>Herman E. Wornom</i> 290
Religious Education — Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish — A Symposium	
I Protestant Religious Education	<i>William Clayton Bower</i> 291
II Catholic Education in the U.S.A. in 1953	<i>Frederick G. Hochwalt</i> 310
III Jewish Education in the United States at the Mid-Century	<i>Israel S. Chipkin</i> 327
Religious Education and Intercultural Relationships —	
A Syllabus	prepared by <i>Stewart G. Cole</i> 351

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please notify RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, 545 West 111th Street, New York 25, N. Y., of change of address, giving both old and new addresses.

Send notification of change of address at least four weeks in advance. The United States Post Office does not automatically forward second class matter.

Entered as second-class matter, January 23, 1948, at the Post Office at Oberlin, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE PROGRAM AND PERSONNEL OF THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION

The first edition of the full program of the Golden Anniversary Convention of the Religious Education Association is published as a supplement to this issue of the Journal. Four features of the program stand out: the inclusiveness of its leadership, the authority of their experience and position, the fundamental problems to be explored, and provision for participation in their exploration by every member of the Convention.

Perhaps no other Convention of our Century, dealing with education and religion, has chosen for its leaders persons of such varied experiences and approaches to religious education. The seventy-seven persons named in the program comprise thirty-two leaders of Protestant activities; twenty-one of Roman Catholic; eighteen of Jewish; and one Eastern Orthodox; five are leaders in public tax supported institutions. Moreover these leaders come from all sections of the United States and from Canada. By bringing all their varied views and insights together at one time, the Convention will provide for a more inclusive look at the religious education enterprise in our two nations than has hitherto been available.

The Convention leadership also represents great authority — the authority of seasoned experience in religious education and of persons in central positions in shaping the policies and execution of religious education in various denominational or faith bodies. What these leaders will have to say at the Convention will reflect the great body of thought about and direction of religious education practice in our times. Those who attend the Convention may thus have an unparalleled opportunity for an authentic as well as an inclusive look at the place and adequacy of religious education today.

But the Convention would fail of its objectives if those who attended simply listened to and absorbed the wisdom of its eminent leaders. In planning the program, the Committee assumed that every registered member of the Convention would have some experience of the problems faced and would *share* that experience with other members. The exploratory work of the Convention will be done in twelve Seminars and Workshops. The named leaders of these groups will open and guide the discussions, but the range, quality and results of the thinking done will depend on the shared wisdom of members of each group.

The program does not allow for investigation of every problem of religious education, but it does provide for a comprehensive and detailed exploration of certain fundamental problems with which all leaders of religious education, of whatever faith, are profoundly concerned. For example, why is religion in a peripheral rather than central position in the education of our youth? Why are many millions of our children and youth growing up without any substantial religious training? Why are so many of our religious education enterprises so feebly supported? Why is so much of our excellent "know how" so poorly executed? In trying to find answers to such questions the program calls for exploration of aspects of our culture, government, social and religious institutions, and philosophies of education which impede provision of substantial religious education for the young of America and Canada. The program calls for thinking together on basic strategies whereby the home, the church and synagogue, or public, private and parochial schools, our institutions of higher learning and our communities at large may make adequate and effective provision of religious education for *all* our children and youth.

Those who may have a creative influence on the future place and provision of religious education in their local communities and institutions, in their denominational and faith bodies or in our nation as a whole are cordially invited to attend the Convention. Members of the Religious Education Association are urged to make maximum effort during September and October to tell all such leaders about the Convention and to persuade them to attend.

In order to spread the good news of the Convention, members may secure extra copies of the program by writing the national office of the R.E.A. at 545 West 111th St., New York 25, N. Y.

HERMAN E. WORNOM,
General Secretary, Religious Education Association

Religious Education—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish

A SYMPOSIUM

One of the purposes of the Golden Anniversary Convention in Pittsburgh, November 8-10, 1953 is to study current religious education.

In order to prepare for this Convention three authors—a Protestant, a Catholic and a Jew—were asked to write on the apparatus of religious education from the point of view of his faith. We are indebted to these authors for their warm cooperation and constructive statements.

These articles constitute the fourth series of pre-convention studies.

In order to have these statements and also a Syllabus on Religious Education and Intercultural Relationships in this issue it was necessary to omit the book review section and also "Significant Evidence." These will be in the next issue.

—The Editorial Committee

I

PROTESTANT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER¹

Professor Emeritus, Divinity School, University of Chicago

PROTESTANT religious education can best be understood as a process in which continuity and change are inseparably united. Its present objectives, organization, content, and procedures have taken form with comparative rapidity on a Protestant-wide scale during the second quarter of the present century. For this reason a static description of Protestant religious education as of the present date would lack much of the meaning and *raison d'être* which can only be had from an understanding of the processes that have eventuated in Protestant religious education at mid-century. This is why, in the interpretative account which follows considerable emphasis has been placed upon its developmental aspects.

I

A Venture In Co-Operation

In America Protestantism, which derives from the Reformation of the sixteenth cen-

¹Co-author with Percy Roy Hayward of *Protestantism Faces Its Educational Task Together* (Nelson, 1929).

The author expresses his thanks to the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America for permission to draw freely and to quote from *Protestantism Faces Its Educational Task Together*.

tury in Europe, is differentiated, according to the 1952 Yearbook of the Churches, into 229 denominations. As was to be expected, Protestant religious education has followed for the most part this multiform denominational structure. When religion was excluded from the public schools in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the several churches undertook to provide education in religion for their own children and young people. Consequently, while there is a broad common basis of Evangelical belief and practice, each denomination tends to stress its particular theological interpretations, liturgical practices, and ecclesiastical polity.

Notwithstanding the denominational alignment of Protestant religious education, there has from the beginning been a strong tendency on the part of Protestants to co-operate in the field of religious education. Early co-operation in this area was on the part of individuals rather than denominations, and took such forms as local city unions beginning in Philadelphia in 1791, the American Sunday School Union in 1824, the International Sunday School Association in 1905, and the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations in 1910.

The International Sunday School Associa-

tion was chiefly a popular lay movement conforming to the convention type, but with a Lesson Committee which prepared outlines of Uniform Lessons, biblical in content and arranged in cycles, to be used simultaneously by all denominations throughout the world. It also developed popular standards and leadership training schools and courses, and conducted extensive field work. The Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations, on the other hand, was composed of representatives of the member denominations who were on the whole professional religious educators and who stressed educational ideals.

As was inevitable, tension arose between these two types of organization. This tension and a growing sense of responsibility for the religious nurture of children and youth under the conditions of the modern world led to discussions as to the possibility and desirability of the educational forces of the Protestant churches getting together in an effective national organization involving all the denominations wishing to associate themselves in a united enterprise for affecting a genuinely educational program for Evangelical Protestantism.

The result was the merger of these two bodies into the International Council of Religious Education in 1922. In the deepest sense that step may be termed an adventure in co-operation on a scale that Protestantism had not achieved before. It was a conscious and intentional attempt on the part of Protestantism to face its educational task together. The Council provided an effective structure by which the Protestant churches could pool their personal, intellectual, and spiritual resources in formulating their common objectives, in working out a basic philosophy, in creating educational materials, in training a competent leadership, and in adopting overall policies as well as in establishing working relations with the home, the public school, and other social agencies. Under this organization the participating denominations became component elements of the Council. In effect, the Council was the denominations working together for the development and execution of a Protestant educational program for the United States and Canada.

The membership of the Council consisted originally of 40 denominations, representing approximately 85 per cent of the Protestant constituency of the United States and Canada. Its first president was Dr. W. O. Thompson, President of the University of Ohio, and its first general secretary was Dr. Hugh S. Magill, at the time of his appointment Field Secretary of the National Educational Association.

In 1950 the International Council was merged with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Council of Church Women, the National Protestant Council on Higher Education, and seven other interdenominational agencies to form the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The former work of the International Council of Religious Education is being carried forward by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches.

The merger of these 11 national bodies with their manifold functions and activities carried the adventure in co-operation to its logical consummation by achieving a functional unity of purpose, planning and action of the Protestant forces in America. Thus, what began as a dream growing out of felt needs has become a living reality at mid-century.

II

Organizational Structure

In keeping with its educational ideal, the International Council of Religious Education proceeded on the assumption that its organization should not be merely an external mechanical structure to house an educational operation, but a living organism and itself a creative instrument. It was, therefore, designed to be functional, democratic, based upon the needs of the constituency at local levels, and flexible in order to meet changing needs. The purpose of the Council was stated as follows:

In pursuance of its purpose as stated in its charter, it shall be the function of the International Council of Religious Education to serve as an agency of the churches of North America through which they may

engage co-operatively in mutual helpfulness toward maintaining and developing the most effective program of Christian education and through which their leaders in Christian education may (a) enjoy the inspiration and self-education which come through fellowship, (b) share convictions, ideas, and experiences, (d) co-operate in examining areas of needed service, (e) carry on co-operative research, (f) carry on activities for enrichment of their denominational programs, (g) plan together religious education activities of a community nature, (h) co-operate in developing a public mind favorable to the conduct of Christian education, (i) unite in carrying on certain designated aspects of their work, (j) conduct joint experimentation in needed new fields vital to Christian education, (k) provide a means whereby two or more denominations may join in common endeavors of their choice, (l) organize and assist councils of churches or of religious education at each geographical level, and (m) join in such other plans and activities as may seem wise and helpful.²

Originally, the basic units of the organizational structure consisted of:

1. The Council composed of 20 persons chosen by the Quadrennial Convention, one or more representatives of state, provincial, or national associations proportional to their Sunday school enrollment, an equal number of representatives of the affiliated denominations proportional to their Sunday school enrollment, 12 members at large, and life members. The functions of the Council were to determine general policy, create departments, employ members of the staff, to approve for execution recommendations cleared through the Commission on Educational Program, and arrange for and report to the Quadrennial Convention.

2. A Board of Trustees of 20 members responsible for carrying on the *ad interim* activities of the Council, finance, and by-laws.

3. A Commission on Educational Program the function of which was to review and evaluate and integrate recommendations originating in its sub-committees and recom-

mend action to the Council. Its 14 committees consisted of The Religious Education of Children, The Religious Education of Youth, The Religious Education of Adults, Leadership Education, Church School Administration, Vacation Religious Education, Weekday Religious Education, Audio-Visual and Radio Education, Field Program, Camps and Conferences, Educational Evangelism, Uniform Lessons, Graded Lessons, and Ecumenical Education.

4. A Joint Committee of representatives of 17 Associated Sections with sections on Denominational Executives, Children's Work, Young People's Work, Adult Work, Leadership Education, Directors, Weekday Church School, Missionary Education, State and Regional Executives, City Executives, Publishers, Editors, Professors, Research, Pastors, and Laymen.

In addition the Council had direct organic relations with member denominational boards of Christian education, denominational publishing houses, and colleges and seminaries, on the one hand, and, on the other, with state councils of Christian education having departments closely paralleling those of the Commission on Educational Program.

The immensely significant thing is that in this merger the International Council by losing its life has found it, magnified by the new dimensions of its relationships and by its central place in a united Protestantism. Most of all, religious education has been integrated into the life and work of the Protestant churches of America and its educational ideals are permeating the whole.

III

Basic Philosophy

Under the conviction that to be productive a program of action must be controlled by ideas, Protestant religious education has felt it necessary to formulate a basic philosophy in terms of certain guiding principles. These have to do with a philosophy of organization, theological foundations, and educational theory.

The organizational structure described under II is based upon the conviction that the function of organization is to co-ordinate

²*Protestantism Faces Its Educational Task Together*, p. 47.

a creative group experience rather than to impose the thinking and purposing of an authoritative overhead upon subordinate operating units. Being based upon the needs of local groups, denominations, and communities, the movement of ideas and purposes is from the operative levels of religious education upward through the review and coordination of divergent proposals in the Commission on General Christian Education to the Assembly for final review and authorization. Thereafter the proposed programs that have been reviewed and appraised go back to the operational groups for execution. Such an organization seeks to be democratic and autonomous.

Also underlying the organizational structure of the Division of Christian Education is a philosophy of co-operation. It is that a vital and functional unity is best achieved, where so many widely differing theological beliefs, ecclesiastical polities, and liturgical practices are involved, by focusing attention upon common practical needs and problems and by sharing resources in meeting and solving them, rather than upon attempting to secure theological agreement.

A third assumption regarding co-operation is that differences are to be considered as assets to be understood and utilized rather than liabilities to be minimized and avoided. The results are the broadening of the basis for a program, the widening of perspectives, and the enrichment of shared experience. The experience of the division of Christian Education has abundantly shown that on this basis groups of widely differing beliefs and polity can not only work effectively together, but can transform the negative attitude of tolerance into a creative experience of understanding and appreciation.

A fourth assumption is that organization should follow and serve function. This means that in a dynamic movement the organizational structure needs to be flexible and subject to frequent review so as to change as new needs arise.

The second basic philosophy has to do with the theological foundations of Christian education. Until 1940 the International Council not only steadfastly refused to impose any

creed upon its co-operating members, but scrupulously avoided making any declaration of a theological position, except that it identified itself with the Evangelical tradition.

In 1937, as a result of the new emphasis upon theology following the chaotic and frustrating conditions incident to World War I, there were those who felt that the Council should re-examine its educational philosophy and give consideration to its theological presuppositions. Accordingly, a committee, with Dean Luther A. Weigle as chairman, drew up an official statement covering a number of aspects of Protestant religious education, including a section on "Christian Faith," in a publication under the title, *Christian Education Today*.

In the matter of theology, as in a philosophy of education, *Christian Education Today* marks a distinct turning point in the thinking of the Council. While disavowing that it is the business of the council to attempt to formulate the common faith of the churches, it nevertheless asserts "its right and duty to declare its Christian faith." It then proceeds to state its opposition to extreme humanistic and extreme neo-orthodox theology, and in general and undefined terms to affirm an ethic of love, social idealism, the divine initiative, reconciliation of the world through Christ, and the organic relation of reason and revelation. Nevertheless, the Council had broken its earlier precedent and taken the first step in theologizing Protestant religious education.

After World War II the chaos and frustration following World War I were deepened by the presence of a devastating crisis, accompanied by a wide-spread feeling of human inadequacy and anxiety. Accordingly, a Committee on Christian Education, including a number of professional theologians, was appointed in 1944 to make a study of the Council's underlying philosophy and procedures. This study included an extended section on "Theological Foundations." The committee's report carried much farther the shift in emphasis upon theology than *Christian Education Today*. While disavowing any intention of imposing an orthodoxy upon the Council, the adoption of the committee's

report had the practical effect of committing the Council to a conservative theological position that affirmed the dual nature of man, that he lives in two worlds, that in his deepest nature man is irrational, that as a fallen creature he is in need of divine deliverance which he is incapable of achieving, that his present predicament is due to original sin, and that there is no salvation outside the church. It stressed the "divinely given" communicated through a supernatural revelation.

The third basic philosophy has to do with the nature and purpose of the educative process.

The International Uniform Lessons which had been used almost exclusively by the Protestant churches since 1872, were content-centered, consisting entirely of brief passages from the Bible selected alternately from the Old and New Testaments, arranged in seven-year cycles (later 6), and designed for simultaneous use by all the age-groups in all the churches throughout the world. In recent years, in view of the extreme difficulty of using these lessons with young children, an attempt was made to adapt the uniform portions of the Bible to the understanding and interest of children. The method was wholly transmissive in the Herbartian tradition. Education was thought of as knowledge to be transmitted.

In 1908, under the influence of Pestalozzi and Froebel, workers with children secured permission from the International Lesson Committee to prepare a series of Graded Lessons based upon the maturity, interests, and capacities of pupils at the several age levels. These teachers, influenced by the new trends in educational theory and practice that were affecting education in the United States at the beginning of the century, were interested primarily in the growth of persons and secondarily in subject-matter.

By 1920 the lesson situation had become confused, with various denominations experimenting on their own with various types of lesson materials. In that year a Commission of Seven was appointed by the International Lesson Committee to make a comprehensive

study of the types of lessons to be provided for the use of Protestant churches. In 1922 the Commission recommended that the Uniform Lessons be continued, that Group Graded Lessons be substituted for the Closely Graded Lessons, and that an entirely new type of curriculum be created for the use of Sunday and Weekday schools, in the light of the most recent trends in educational theory and practice, to be known as *The International Curriculum of Religious Education*. The committee charged with this undertaking under the chairmanship of the writer began its work by working out a basic philosophy concerning the nature and function of education and a theory concerning the content and procedure of the curriculum, with the advice of leading American educational theorists and practitioners. According to this philosophy, Christian education is a guided experience in Christian living, in which the growing person is assisted in interpreting, judging, and bringing through to Christian outcomes his responses to the actual life-situations which he faces in every area of his experience, with the aid of the resources of historical religious experience. The subject-matter consists of the situation in which the learner finds himself, his own cumulative past experience, and the religious experience of the race, particularly as recorded in the Bible. Method, inseparable from subject-matter, consists of guidance of the steps by which one responds to a situation through analysis of the factors in the situation and its possible outcomes, search for relevant knowledge, choice of outcome, and carrying the commitment involved in such a choice through to action. This has come to be known as the experience-centered curriculum. It begins and ends in experience. The outcome of such learning through living is a fully matured Christlike personality. This theory was adopted by the Council and was embodied in *The Curriculum Guide* for the use of those working on other types of lesson material.

Christian Education Today marked the beginning of a departure from this philosophy in that, while affirming adherence to many of these basic concepts, it stressed Christian tradition and sought a middle-of-the-road

position between modern functional education and the older forms of transmissive education.

But in 1947 in the section on Theological and Educational Foundations of the report on The Study of Christian Education the divergence becomes clear. Deriving its educational procedures from theological presuppositions rather than from the trends in modern educational theory and practice, it recommended that greater emphasis be placed upon the irrational elements in religious experience and upon man's sinful nature. It stressed man's dependence upon resources beyond himself. It found the norms of Christian education in the convictions, ideals, and cult actions of the historical Christian community, and affirmed, as indicated above, that outside the church there is no salvation. It recommended that a greater corrective emphasis be placed upon authority. It regarded the central function of Christian education to be the induction of growing persons into the Christian community.

IV

Curriculum Development

The idea of an organized curriculum in the modern educational sense was a late development in Protestant religious education. For a considerable time content consisted of fragmentary and unrelated portions from the Bible. In 1872 some order was brought out of this chaos by the adoption of the International Uniform Lessons, described in III above. Not until the Graded Lessons were introduced in 1908 did a curriculum in the true sense begin really to be developed. Since then the concept of the nature and content of the curriculum of Protestant religious education has undergone considerable change. It can only be understood in terms of a developmental process reflecting many different points of view, many shifts of emphasis, conflicts between educational and theological approaches, and the widest possible differences in the practices and demands of the churches.

The contemporary understanding of a comprehensive curricular program for Prot-

estant religious education began with the report of the Commission of Seven of the International Lesson Committee in 1922. It recommended: (1) that the Closely Graded Lessons be not further revised, but turned over to the denominations to do with as they might desire; (2) that the "improved" feature of the Uniform Lessons be discontinued and that outlines be issued as straight Uniform Lessons without adaptations; (3) that a new series of Group Graded Lessons be prepared, biblical in content, dated, and running through three-year cycles, for the several age-groups; and (4) that an entirely new curriculum be created, to be known as the International Curriculum of Religious Education, to provide an integrated curriculum for Sunday and weekday session of the church school, and to be based upon the latest developments of educational theory and practice.

The procedures involved in implementing these principles for the International Curriculum involved research into the experiences of growing persons at the several age levels, the assembling and appraisal of relevant source material, and experimentation in the development of learning units. These undertakings were under way when the International Lesson Committee was merged with the International Council of Religious Education and the functions of the International Curriculum Committee were transferred to the Educational Commission of the Council.

As a result of this transfer, the original policy of the International Curriculum was radically changed. The basic philosophy of the International Curriculum was incorporated into *The Curriculum Guide* as the guiding principle to be used by all committees in preparing lesson outlines and age-group programs. The Group Graded Committee made *The Curriculum Guide* the basis of all their work, though the work of the Improved (under pressure of publishers the "Improved" adaptations were restored) Uniform Committee was little influenced by it. Under the influence of this philosophy in operation the difference between "curriculum" and "program" tended to disappear.

By 1939 the curriculum situation had again become confused. Some denominations had revised the Closely Graded Lessons in their several ways. The Group Graded Lessons were not as widely used as had been expected, and some denominations that had adopted them had discontinued them. Some progressive churches having trained directors were building their own curricula along the lines of the abandoned International Curriculum. A survey showed that 60 per cent of the churches were using Uniform Lessons, 22 per cent Group Graded Lessons, and 18 per cent Closely Graded Lessons. Some churches were using Uniform Lessons for Beginners, Primaries, and Juniors. Ten denominations were not using outlines prepared by the Council.

A Committee on Lesson Policy and Production was appointed to study this situation. It recommended that the Council develop three types of curriculum outlines:

1. International Uniform Bible Lessons. This series is produced in six-year cycles, using a common body of biblical material with different emphases and treatments for the several age-groups.

2. International Graded Lessons. These are wholly biblical and are arranged on the age-group and three-year cycle basis. They seek to interpret the historical faith of Christianity to growing persons at the various age levels. They are a curriculum of the church, seeking to develop an understanding and appreciation of the faith, history, and mission of the church and to develop churchmanship through participation. They place a strong emphasis upon evangelism. The committee having responsibility for this type of lessons has been developing outlines not only for the Sunday church school, but for societies, Weekday and Vacation Church schools, adults, camps, and summer conferences.

3. International Resource Guide, designed for churches wishing to build their own curricula along the lines proposed by the International Curriculum of Religious Education.

The Committee on The Study of Christian Education recommended modifications of the curriculum structure of Protestant religious

education along the lines of the following statement:

The purpose of the curriculum of Christian education is to confront individuals with the eternal gospel, and to nurture within them a life of faith, hope, and love in keeping with the gospel. The organizing of the curriculum from the viewpoint of the Christian gospel is to be found in the changing needs and experiences of the individual as these include his relation to (1) God as revealed in Jesus Christ; (2) his fellowmen and human society; (3) his place in the work of the world; (4) the Christian fellowship, the church; (5) the continuous process of history viewed as a carrier of the divine purpose and revealer of the moral law; (6) the universe in all its wonder and complexity.³

These changes are in process of being made by the Division of Christian Education.

An important characteristic of curriculum procedure in Protestant religious education is that the Division of Christian Education, like the Council before it, publishes no lesson material. Instead, the denominational representatives working in and through the Division of Christian Education co-operatively produce outlines of The International Uniform Bible Lessons and The International Graded Lessons. These outlines are turned over to the co-operating denominations to develop for use in their churches by their own editorial staffs. The Division does, however, publish various bulletins and guidance material for use of the constituent denominations.

V

Age-Group Programs

The Division of Christian Education, like the Council before it, carries forward those aspects of its educational program that have to do with individuals and groups, particularly in the local church, in terms of curriculum and program objectives, materials, and procedures. At many points work with these age-groups overlaps and not a little of the work of these age-group committees is carried on co-operatively.

³*Ibid.*, p. 82.

The Religious Education of Children

As was to be expected, children's workers were, on the whole, the first to feel the need of employing modern educational procedures in religious education. They were concerned with the spiritual growth of immature persons rather than with the transmission of subject-matter, even the Bible, or with the speculations of metaphysical theology.

Since 1872 the Protestant churches had been trying with disappointing results to adapt Uniform Lessons to the comprehension, interests, and needs of children. Workers with children were among the first to come under the influence of Pestalozzi and Froebel with their ideas of education as the guided growth of the young. It was they who in 1908 asked for and received authorization to prepare a series of closely graded lessons for children suited to their backgrounds of experience, as well as physical and mental growth.

It was also quite natural that the Committee on the Religious Education of Children, when it came into being with the organization of the International Council, should adopt the experience-centered theory of the curriculum of the International Curriculum of Religious Education, as set forth under III above, as the basis for its procedure. In accordance with this philosophy, the Committee undertook the task of listing the life-situations of children under 12, under the 11 Areas of Experience worked out by the Bureau of Research, of assembling source material from the Bible, nature lore, biography, and literature, and of developing units of learning. In dealing with these units, the Committee has sought continuously to avoid atomism by following a policy of securing "sequence, balance, and comprehensiveness" in the elementary curriculum.

The Committee on the Religious Education of Children has outlined six fundamental goals upon which to base its program: (1) relationship with God and ideas of God; (2) relationship with Jesus and ideas of Jesus; (3) the child and church fellowship; (4) the child's heritage in the Bible; (5) the child in personal relationships; (6) the child in social relationships. Under each of these goals the

Committee suggests what is implied in the goal for children at the Nursery, Kindergarten, Primary, and Junior levels and the kinds of experiences, materials, and procedures that will guide the children toward their realization.

Attempting to guide the growth of children in Christian understandings, attitudes, and conduct quickly brought the workers with children into a realization that their responsibility is shared with parents. Therefore, the Committee has sought to establish relations with the home and to secure the understanding co-operation of parents. To further this sharing of educational responsibility, the Committee on the Religious Education of Children has co-operated with the Committee on the Religious Education of Adults in holding family camps and in developing materials for parent education.

The Religious Education of Youth

Perhaps in no phase of Protestant religious education has the development process been more in evidence than in the religious education of youth. As in Protestant religious education as a whole, this development has been in the direction of the integration of many disparate youth programs under different sponsorships into a comprehensive United Christian Youth Movement under the direction of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches.

Prior to the organization of the International Council there had been two international youth organizations, one sponsored by the International Sunday School Association and the other sponsored by the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations. Besides these there were several other youth organizations, such as Christian Endeavor, denominational organizations like the Baptist Young Peoples' Union and the Epworth League, and the Y. M. and Y. W. C. A. Each of these had its own objectives and program, though with many common elements.

With the organization of the International Council and the creation of a Committee on the Religious Education of Youth, through a process of reconciliation of differences

often amounting to conflict, the present United Christian Youth Movement was evolved. While the roots of the movement went back through many years, its immediate impetus grew out of the troubled situation in which the youth of the post World War I period found themselves. This mood found expression in a statement of a conference of national and state youth leaders in Chicago in 1934:

Oppressed by the terrific emergency of our times, impressed with the limitless possibilities of this hour, there is a united intention to essay nothing less than the ordering of all life according to the way revealed by Jesus Christ.⁴

The Conference chose as its covering title for its program "Christian Youth Building a New World," with "A New Person," "A New Home," "A New Church," "A New Nation," and "A New World" as its goals. This impetus gave to the United Youth Movement a definite orientation toward social issues and action.

With the approach of World War II, the ecumenical emphasis became strong in the United Christian Youth Movement. It participated in the Amsterdam World Conference of Christian Youth in 1939. This note was accentuated at the Conference at Estes Park in 1941. At the Conference at Lake Geneva in 1943 it was affirmed that "We must go beyond general principles to definite plans for action." A vigorous attempt was made to secure co-operative Christian action by youth in local communities with emphasis on relief, reconstruction, racial brotherhood, evangelism, and the ecumenical church. In recent years a strong emphasis has been placed on evangelism, finding expression in Christian Youth Crusades, Religious Emphasis Week on college and university campuses, and high school Christian youth missions. From the beginning camping has occupied a large place in the religious education of Protestant youth.

The Religious Education of Adults

As in general education, a program for the religious education of adults was slow in

getting under way. It had been generally held that adults could not learn effectively beyond the age of 35, except in lines of specialized and professional interests. As the result of E. L. Thorndike's study of the capacity of adults to learn it is now understood that owing to maturity, interest, and background experience adults are not only better equipped to learn than the immature, but that effective learning continues throughout life.

Moreover, because adults are so deeply involved in the complex processes and problems of economic, family, civic, and international life, they are more in need of learning than any other age-group. Furthermore, since it is adults who make decisions and formulate and execute policies, the effective power of social control lies in their hands. Since the development of personality depends so much upon the interaction of the growing self and society, it has become clear there are limits as to what education can do when working only with children and young people. For these reasons some educational philosophers and practitioners have come to feel that the strategic point at which to approach education is at the adult level, without neglecting in the slightest degree the education of the young. As one pastor put it:

I have spent the greater portion of my teaching experience with the childhood and youth groups. . . . But almost as consistently as I have tried to build up this program in the church I have seen it being retarded and undermined by the outside environment into which the children must go. . . . For the benefit of childhood and young life then, as well as for the sake of adults themselves, I have almost been driven to believe that the starting point must be adult education in religion or at least they must go hand in hand.⁵

From 1930 on the International Council gave increasing attention to the religious education of adults. The scope and function of the religious education of adults was stated under six items:

1. To enlist and develop a full adult church membership which is informed,

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 136.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 128.

alert, and consciously responsible with respect to the Christian education of childhood and youth. This involves not only effective learning groups, but a total church life and atmosphere conducive to the participation and spiritual growth of all ages, and primarily devoted thereto.

2. To assist and co-operate with pastors in organizing and directing the total church program in accordance with sound educational procedure in fulfilling the church's educational function.

3. To provide a systematic and adequate program in Christian education for parenthood.

4. To prepare and organize the man power and woman power of the church as informed, alert, consecrated, and united "workers together with God" in the redemption of our distraught and pain-racked social and economic order.

5. To provide for the continuous religious growth of individual adults through activities of Christian living, through intelligent Christian adjustment to our changing world and growing knowledge, and through personal relations with God.

6. To secure the commitment of other men and women in the community to Christ and his way of living and to continued spiritual growth therein.⁶

In 1935 the Adult Department developed a comprehensive program for the religious education of adults under the title, "Learning for Life: a Program for Adults in the Church." The program was broken down into seven areas:

1. *The Bible in Life*, with courses and recommended texts on "Our Bible," "The Old Testament," "The New Testament," "Life and Teachings of Jesus," "Life and Work of Paul," "The Prophets and Their Message," and "The Psalms."

2. *Personal Faith and Experience*, with courses on "Personal Religious Living," "What It Means to be a Christian," "The Meaning of God," "Christian Stewardship," "Christian Worship," "Christian Beliefs," "The Ministry of Beauty," "A Christian Philosophy of Life," "A Christian and Health," "What Religion Does for Personality," and "The Christian Use of Sunday."

3. *Christian Family Life*, with courses on "Living Together in the Home," "Home and Church in Co-operation," "Family Policies and Relationships," "Sex Education," "The Home Guidance of Children," "The Home Guidance of Adolescents," "Preparation for Marriage," "The Unmarried Adult in Home and Church Life."

4. *Church Life and Outreach*, with courses on "Our Church," "The History of the Church," "The Church as a School in Christian Living," "The Church's Program of Evangelism," "The Church in Social Action," "New Missionary Frontiers in America," "Christian Co-operation and Unity," and current missionary courses.

5. *Community Issues*, with courses on "Christianizing Community Life," "Amusements in Our Community," "Gambling," "Liquor and Other Narcotics," "Delinquency and Crime," "Co-operatives," and "Race and Group Relations."

6. *Major Social Problems*, with courses on "Social Issues and the Christian Ideal," "Christianizing the Economic Order," "Current Social Issues," "Economic Problems Confronting Our World Today," "Christianity and Competing World Philosophies," and "Government and Christian Citizenship."

7. *World Relations*, with courses on "The Missionary Character of Christianity," "World Christianity and the World Church," "The Christian Mission in a Particular Country or Area," "Christian Missions and World Peace," "What About War?", "The Family of Nations," and "The World's Great Religions."

An increasing emphasis has been placed on family life, and the Department, in co-operation with the Jewish and Catholic faiths, had a part in having National Family Week established. The Study of Christian Education has further pointed up this emphasis on the family, and recommended that pre-eminence be given to the family in Protestant religious education.

In the light of conditions created by the war, the Department raised with adults in the churches the issue of "What Can Christians Do Now?" and with other agencies of the church held a conference on "The Conservation of Family Life." At the close of World War II it co-operated in holding a

⁶Ibid., p. 137.

conference on post war responsibilities out of which grew a number of projects in "Spiritual Mobilization."

VI

Leadership Education

Protestant religious education has long recognized, along with other educational agencies, that the effectiveness of the church's educational program depends more than upon anything else upon the adequate preparation of its teachers and administrators.

Until comparatively recently and still predominantly, the Protestant churches depend upon volunteer, unpaid lay teachers. In recent years the general pattern has been considerably changed by the emergence of a group of professional religious educators composed of directors, age-group specialists, denominational and inter-denominational executives, and, to an increasing extent, weekday teachers. But the problem of depending predominantly upon untrained lay teachers and administrators of widely varying educational backgrounds whose chief guarantees of efficiency are seriousness of purpose and loyalty to what at best is an avocation still remains.

The degree to which the co-operating Protestant churches have succeeded in solving this problem is quantitatively indicated by the fact that in the peak year, 1938-39, since the present Standard Leadership Curriculum was adopted in 1936 there were 677 interdenominational schools with approximately 3,000 classes and an enrollment of some 75,000. In that year some 35,000 credits were issued by the International Council. The influence of these schools is somewhat augmented by the fact that probably one-half of those enrolled were not seeking credit. In the same year 146,193 credits were issued by denominations. In all, during the period from 1938-39 to 1944-45 202,647 credits were issued by the Council and 929,857 by denominations. Though these are in themselves impressive figures, when they are placed against the background of the 2,000,000 or 2,500,000 church school teachers the grave limitations of the program are apparent. It means that vast numbers of

Protestant church school teachers and superintendents are untrained.

The International Council gave much concerned attention to the problem of leadership education. After many years of various forms of popular short courses going back to the International Sunday School Association, The Council in 1936 adopted the Standard Leadership Curriculum which is still in use. Outlines for the Standard Curriculum are issued in three series. The First Series is designed for teachers who have had no previous training and are, for one reason or another, either able or willing to devote only a limited time to formal training. The First Series consists of 52 courses under two sections: (1) General Courses and (2) Specialized Courses in the several Divisions of the church school.

The Second, or more advanced, Series is designed for teachers who are ready to extend their present training and are able to use a more advanced type of textbook and reference material and are able to devote a considerable amount of time to formal preparation. The Second Series, like the First, consists of two sections, General Courses and Specialized Courses in Division of the church school. As in the First Series, a core of fundamental courses the first section is elected under guidance, as is a sequence under guidance in the section on specialized courses. The content of the Second Series, with available courses is as follows:

Group I, General Courses:

Religion in Personal and Social Life:
Personal Religious Living.
Christian Basis of World Order.
The Christian Message of our Present-day World.
Christian Stewardship.
My Christian Beliefs.

The Bible:

How the Bible Came to Be.
The Making of the English Bible.
The Old Testament: Its Content and Values.
The New Testament: Its Content and Values.
The Prophets and Their Messages.
Jesus and His Teachings.
Paul, the Man and His Work.

Teaching Values in the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament.

The Church:

The Purpose and Program of the Church.

The Church through the Centuries.
Our World Christian Fellowship.

Psychology and Method for Church Leaders:

Understanding Our Pupils.

Christian Character and How It Develops.

Ways of Teaching.

Dramatics in Christian Education.

Music in Christian Education.

Audio-Visual Resources in Christian Education.

Story Telling in Christian Education.

Planning and Leading Christian Worship.

Alcohol Education in the Church.

Teaching in the Weekday Church School.

Teaching in the Vacation Church School.

Camp Counseling.

Missionary Education:

Missionary Education in the Local Church.

The Christian Task at Home.

The Christian Task Abroad.

Group II: Specialization Courses:

Children's Division Courses:

Understanding Children.

Teaching Children.

The Work of the Children's Division.

The Home and Church Working Together for Children.

The Child's Approach to Religion.

The Use of the Bible with Children.

When Children Worship.

Music and the Children of the Church.

Nursery Department Courses:

Teaching Nursery Children.

Kindergarten Department Courses:

The Work of the Kindergarten Department.

Primary Department Courses:

Teaching Primary Children.

The Work of the Primary Department.

Junior Department Courses:

Teaching Juniors.

The Work of the Junior Department.

Youth Division Courses:

Understanding Youth.

The Youth Fellowship.

Helping Young People Develop Christian Beliefs.

Intermediate Department Courses

(Junior High):

Teaching Intermediates.

The Church's Program for Intermediates.

Adult Division Courses:

Understanding Adults.

Guidance in Christian Home-Making.

Leadership Development Courses:

Leadership Education in the Local Church.

Methods in Supervision and Teacher Guidance.

Leadership for United Church Women.

Administration Courses:

Administering the Sunday Church School.

The Superintendent and His Task.

Administering the Vacation Church School.

In addition there are some 20 additional courses available for use where instructors with the necessary skill and experience can be provided.

The Third Series is designed for teachers and administrators who have completed the work covered in the Second Series and have had considerable experience in leadership. This series, not yet fully worked out, has had very limited use.

Leadership courses are offered in local churches, denominational and interdenominational schools, and community schools in which local denominations co-operate. The International Council had worked out standards as to length of school, arrangement of courses for credit, and accreditation of instructors and deans, and these are being carried forward by the Division of Christian Education.

The Committee on The Study of Christian Education gave much concerned attention to leadership education. It concluded that the type of leadership education represented by the present Standard Leadership Curriculum needs thorough re-examination and reappraisal. It seemed to the Committee that

since the present program is centered chiefly in formal courses with textbooks taught more or less apart from the experience of leadership, the present leadership program is outmoded, especially in the light of recent developments in general teacher-education. It is recommended that the present program be revised along the following lines:

1. That more emphasis be placed upon informal procedures.
2. That greater use be made of laboratory schools, observation-practice opportunities, workshops, and in-service supervision, on the theory that teachers, like their pupils, best learn by guided experience.
3. That more emphasis be placed upon the personal religious experience and growth of teachers themselves.
4. That the concept of leadership be broadened to include all the operations of the church as a functioning community, thus making religious education an integral part of every phase of the total life and work of the church.
5. That a new and special emphasis be placed upon the minister as the primary agent in the preparation of the leadership of the church. The Committee feels that the pastor is as much responsible for the program of Christian education in his parish as he is for preaching, pastoral care, evangelism, missions, or administration. It feels that in view of this responsibility the theological seminaries should re-examine their programs for the education of ministers so that an understanding of the educational process shall be an integral part of the preparation of all ministers and not merely a field of specialization for professional religious educators.

The problems of leadership education in Protestant religious education are many and difficult. But within the framework of existing conditions much progress has been made, not only quantitatively but qualitatively. Despite the somewhat traditional philosophy upon which the present leadership program rests, both in the number of teachers reached and in improvement in the teaching function of the church, much has been accomplished. A fund of experience

has been accumulated for improving leadership education in the future in the light of changes in contemporary culture, the changing needs of the churches, and developments of educational theory and practice.

VII

Vacation and Weekday Religious Education

One of the persistent problems of Protestant religious education has been the relating of religious education to public education. Since the exclusion of religion from the public schools in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the public schools have assumed responsibility for the secular education of all the childhood and youth of the nation, under the supervision of the state and on funds derived from taxation. Under the principle of the separation of church and state, the Protestant churches for a century assumed responsibility for religious education chiefly through the Sunday School. The Sunday School, which was one type of philanthropic school in Europe, was imported from England in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Designed for teaching the three R's and some elements of morality and religion to the urchins on the streets of Gloucester, it had its origin in social conditions very different from those existing in America. Until the beginning of the present century the Sunday School retained its original philanthropic and evangelistic character. With the changes in its educational purpose and method during the first quarter of the century the Sunday School took on increasingly the nature of a genuinely educational institution as was indicated in part by the adoption of the name Church School, with Sunday and weekday sessions.

Even so, its ministry was almost exclusively to the children and youth of the Protestant churches, leaving unreached great areas of the child and youth population of the nation. At mid-century, the combined membership of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish communions is approximately 58 per cent of the population of the United States. It is estimated that less than half of the children and young people of the nation are receiving any systematic religious instruction, whether

Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish, whereas the public schools minister to all the children and young people of the United States.

The major experiment of the Protestant churches in bringing religious education into relation with public education in such a way as not to violate the principle of the separation of church and state and at the same time reach those outside the range of religious education is through Vacation and Weekday Church Schools. Both of these movements antedated the development of an educational program through the International Council of Religious Education. Since its organization, the Protestant churches co-operating through the Council have felt a deep concern with reference to this problem, and through the Department of Weekday Religious Education have placed great emphasis upon it.

The Vacation Church Schools utilize the summer interval between sessions of the public school for periods of religious instruction. As the work of these schools was integrated into the educational programs of a number of denominations and of the International Council, their educational character was greatly improved, with standards for curriculum, courses of study, and teaching personnel. In 1943 there were over 70,000 Vacation Church Schools, with more than 3,000,000 pupils.

The Weekday Church School had its origin at Gary, Indiana, in 1914 with an overture by Superintendent Wirt to the churches of the community to offer courses in religion on time allocated from the public school schedule. The general pattern is for such instruction to be given by teachers supplied by the churches in church property on time released from the school at the request of parents. Though in a number of instances such instruction is given by denominations, the dominant trend is for denominations in a given community to co-operate in the conduct of weekday religious education under the supervision of a community council. In a few instances religious instruction was given in school property by teachers supplied by the churches. In a few other instances religious instruction was given in the schools by teachers certified by the state but

at church expense. In 1948 weekday schools were conducted in 3,000 communities in 46 states, with an enrollment of over 2,000,000.

In 1948, however, the Supreme Court rendered an eight-to-one decision in the Champaign, Illinois, case, making it illegal to offer religious instruction by the churches in public school property. In individual opinions four of the Justices, in accord with the dissenting Justice, were unwilling to ban all forms of released time not involving the use of public school property or machinery. The policy of the Council's Department of Weekday Religious Education had consistently been in accord with the decision of the Supreme Court. The formal legal status of other forms of released time remain somewhat indeterminate until similar court action is taken in other places and under other conditions. In the meantime, the Protestant churches are going forward with their weekday program under the guidance of the Division of Christian Education. In some communities weekday religious education is being conducted co-operatively by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The percentage of school enrollment reached by the Weekday Church School varies with communities, it being in some communities quite high. In some communities, as in Ohio and Virginia, an effort has been made to co-ordinate the courses in religion with those in the subject-matter fields of the public school curriculum.

That weekday religious education is a solution to the problem of relating religion and public education probably not even the most enthusiastic advocates of released time would affirm. Nevertheless, it has been a significant experiment, and an invaluable fund of experience has been accumulated for guidance in further efforts to solve this difficult and complex problem.

Meanwhile, a nation-wide concern has developed in regard to this problem. The Whitehouse Conference on Children in a Democracy urged that it be studied by a commission and a solution proposed. The American Council on Education, at the request of the National Council of Christians and Jews, appointed a committee to study the problem and to make suggestions. The committee's

report on *The Relation of Religion to Public Education* in 1947 recommended forthrightly that the study (as distinguished from the teaching) of religion as a phase of historical and contemporary culture should be incorporated into the curriculum of the public school. The American Council on Education as a result now has a committee at work exploring the state of opinion among schoolmen and religious leaders as to the feasibility of this proposal which has just released its report in *The Function of the Public School in Dealing with Religion*. The committee feels that there is a sufficient body of opinion to justify setting up experimental centers.

Similarly, the Commission on Educational Policy has given much study to this problem. Its report, *Moral and Spiritual Values in Education*, 1951, takes the position that the schools can not only legally include moral and spiritual values, functionally as distinguished from theologically conceived, in their program, but are under obligation to do so. In Kentucky a large scale experiment has been under way for four years on a program of emphasis on moral and spiritual values, functionally conceived, in the elementary and secondary schools of the state as an integral part of the program of the State Department of Education, with a Director on the staff. Courses for teachers-in-service or in preparation are being offered in all the tax-supported teacher-education institutions of the Commonwealth to prepare teachers and administrators in this field.

These recent developments are radically changing the conditions that gave rise to Protestant Weekday Religious Education. To the extent that they become incorporated into the educational procedures of the public schools they call for a complete restudy of the weekday program and a reconsideration of the allocation of functions between the schools and the churches. At any rate, the way seems to be opening for religion to become an integral part of the education of American children and youth without violating the principle of the separation of church and state, while at the same time providing the conditions under which Protestants, Cath-

olics, and Jews may co-operate in meeting the moral and spiritual needs of American children and young people, on the one hand, and of the nation, on the other.

VIII Research

When the Protestant churches co-operatively launched upon a genuinely educational program with the inauguration of the International Council of Religious Education in 1922, they had a conviction that what they undertook to do should rest upon a factual and experimental basis. Consequently, one of the original five sections of the Committee on Education was one on Research, Measurements, and Statistics of which Dr. W. W. Charters was chairman. But it was when the Council got down to the serious business of curriculum construction in the light of modern educational theory and practice that the need for a Bureau of Research became imperative. The establishment of the Bureau was made possible by a generous gift of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. While it came into being as a result of work on the International Curriculum of Religious Education, it soon became evident that it was needed to give a factual and experimental basis for other aspects of the Council's work. The service of the Bureau accounts in large measure for the subsequent rapid development of Protestant religious education during the quarter-century preceding the incorporation of the Council into the National Council of Churches.

In 1928 the Director of the Bureau, Dr. Paul H. Vieth, outlined a comprehensive program of research which gives some understanding of the nature and scope of the work of the Bureau:

1. Such a program (the working out of an adequate program, observing the best educational principles, and providing unity of effort) has lately come to be described by the inclusive term curriculum. The various departments and a number of the committees of the Council are working at tasks the ultimate outcome of which will be curricula in one form or another. . . . The curriculum project will be one of the severest tests of the genius of co-operative work which can possibly be devised.

2. Standards for religious education.

. . . In the final analysis, standards can be built only in the light of the program it is possible to carry out. They serve as statements of what it is desirable to accomplish, and as instruments of measurement of achievement toward the desired goal.

3. More effective and better co-ordinated field organization. . . . Has not the time come when we are ready to build promotional organization on the basis of revealed needs of the field, rather than by piecing together as many fragments as we can rescue from the traditional organizations which have served their day?

4. Leadership in religious education. A strenuous effort is being made by the leaders of training to free the training process from some of the traditional methods and bring it more in line with modern educational theory. One of the best ways to bring this about would be to make careful investigation of the need for leadership and the demands upon it.

5. Agencies of education outside the church. Specifically, the co-operative task of church and state needs to be defined much more closely. . . . This question involves the weekday school in its program and its future development.⁷

It early became evident that there was need for the clarification and formulation of the objectives of Christian education. By analyzing the writings of ten Protestant religious educators ranked as leaders by the professional educators of several denominations, the Bureau proposed the following objectives which were officially adopted by the Council and have continued to guide its activities:

1. To foster in growing persons a consciousness of God as a reality in human experience, and a sense of personal relation to him.

2. To develop in growing persons such an understanding and appreciation of the personality, life, and teachings of Jesus as will lead to experience of him as Savior and Lord, loyalty to him and his cause, and manifest itself in daily life and conduct.

3. To foster in growing persons a progressive and continuous development of Christlike character.

4. To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in and contribute constructively to the building of a social order throughout the world, embodying the ideal of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

5. To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the organized society of Christians—the church.

6. To lead growing persons into a Christian interpretation of life and the universe; the ability to see in it God's purpose and plan; a life philosophy built on this interpretation.

7. To effect in growing persons the assimilation of the best religious experience of the race, pre-eminently that recorded in the Bible, as effective guidance to present experience.⁸

In these research projects the administrative heads and members of the staff have participated under the technical guidance of the successive directors. A detailed listing of its many projects, impossible within the purpose and limits of this interpretative account, would read like a college catalogue of courses. Suffice it to enumerate as illustrative of the Bureau's many-sided work: The objectives of Christian Education, Church School Standards, Church School Reports and Records, Housing Equipment, Religious Education Bibliography by Years, Life Experiences and the Curriculum, The Social Pronouncements of Religious Bodies, Measurements in the Church School, The Religious Education Activities of Three Hundred Pastors, Selected Studies of Weekday Church Schools, The Structure of the Council in Relation to Other Interdenominational Agencies, The Effect of the War upon Persons, and Directors of Religious Education and their Profession.

IX

Bible Revision

In the light of the emphasis of Protestantism upon the Bible as the source of authority in religion and of its place in Protestant religious education, it seems appropriate that one of the major concerns of the International Council of Religious Education should be to

⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 207-8.

⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 208-9.

give the church and the world the most authentic translation to date of the Holy Scriptures.

When in 1929 the copyright on the American Standard Version, held by its publishers, Thomas Nelson and Sons, was about to expire, the publishers requested the International Council as an authentic agency of the co-operating Protestant churches to renew and hold the copyright in order to protect the translation from unauthorized changes. The Council accepted this responsibility and appointed a committee of outstanding scholars to assume custody of the text and consider whether it needed to be revised.

After two years of study, the committee reported that in its judgment there was need for a new translation of the Bible.

The committee recommended that the new translation should follow the Tyndale and King James versions as closely as present knowledge of Hebrew and Greek and present English usage would allow. The Council adopted the recommendations of the committee in the following resolution:

There is need for a version which embodies the best results of modern scholarship as to the meaning of the scriptures and expresses this meaning in English dictation which is designed for use in public and private worship and preserves those qualities which have given to the King James Version a supreme place in English literature. We, therefore, define the task of the American Standard Bible Committee to be that of revision of the present American Standard Bible in the light of the results of modern scholarship, this revision to be designed for use in public and private worship, and to be in the direction of the simple, classic English style of the King James Version.⁹

Funds for the enterprise were provided by Thomas Nelson and Sons. A committee of 32 from among the most distinguished biblical scholars of the United States and Canada was appointed to undertake the revision, with an Advisory Committee of practical churchmen. The Committee was divided into two sections, one on the Old Testament and one on the New.

The procedure of the Committee was meticulous. Initially, parts of the Old and New Testaments were assigned to individual members of the sections for suggested revisions. These proposed revisions were reviewed verse by verse by each section respectively. The further revised draft was then reviewed by the entire Committee. Not until the entire texts of the Old and New Testaments had passed through this care-taking process were they released to the printers.

The New Testament was published in 1946 and the Old Testament in 1952. During the first year of publication a million copies were sold, to be followed by another million the second year.

As a result of these years of scholarly and dedicated labor, the Protestant churches now have a more authentic text of the Holy Scriptures than any preceding generation of Christians. This precious heritage the Protestant churches share with Jews and Catholics as a priceless literary record of the Judeo-Christian tradition from which the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths have alike historically sprung.

X

Trends

Perhaps the best way to appraise a dynamic movement such as Protestant religious education has shown itself to be is in terms of the trends that have made it what it is at mid-century. This is especially true as it faces a future of change and unlimited possibilities for the further development of these trends in new directions and new forms.

As one takes an appraising backward look and an inventory of the potentials with which Protestant religious education faces the future, five such significant trends may be noted:

1. The integration into a functional unity of the educational forces of Protestantism. This was achieved by the bringing together of 40 denominations of widely diverse theological beliefs and ecclesiastical polity, representing some 85 per cent of the Protestant constituency of the United States and Canada. The International Council was, as its successor, the Division of Christian Educa-

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 249.

tion, now *is*, the Protestant Churches of the North American Continent working out together through a democratic process their objectives, their curricula, their standards, and their age-group programs and pooling their personal and spiritual resources for achieving their common ideals and purposes. Out of the denominational chaos and ineffectiveness of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has come a compact, well-organized, and effective educational body to project and effect a well-considered program of religious education. Through facing their educational task together the Protestant churches have discovered that in spite of superficial differences of theological interpretations and ecclesiastical polities that are so characteristic of Protestantism in America there is in Protestantism a deep and comprehending oneness of Christian faith, Christian ideals, and Christian purposes that have made it not only a great historical movement, but an effective force in contemporary American culture.

2. The transformation of a popular and enthusiastic Sunday School movement into a genuinely educational enterprise in which the co-operating Protestant churches have worked out an educational program in the light of the religious needs of children, young people, and adults and of modern educational theory and practice, under the leadership of a highly competent staff trained in leading American Universities in the fields both of religion and education. While much remains to be done under the limitations imposed by the institutional structure and tradition of the Sunday and Weekday Church School, the educational progress that has been made during the last quarter-century has been nothing less than phenomenal.

3. The integration of religious education into the total life of the church. The Sunday School under the International Sunday School Association existed as an institution more or less independent of the church. For long, even under the International Council of Religious Education, religious education was a separate department within the church, with its own objectives, curriculum, and personnel. Recently it has come to be recognized as a co-ordinate function with preaching, pastoral

care, evangelism, and administration. More recently it is coming to be thought of as an integral phase of the entire program of the church, affecting the content and method of preaching, pastoral counseling, evangelism, missions, administration, and finance.

This integration is symbolized by the merging of the International Council of Religious Education with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Council of Church Women, the National Protestant Council on Higher Education and seven other interdenominational bodies to form the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. If the trend in the International Council continues, as there is every reason to expect it will, it may be assumed that religious education, now become an integral part of the National Council of Churches, will increasingly penetrate and modify all the other functions of the co-operating Protestant churches.

4. The effort to relate religious education to public education. Notwithstanding the fact that Weekday Religious Education on time released from the public school schedule may not be the solution of this problem, nevertheless it has been an exploration of the problem and a sincere attempt to do something about it. With this background of more than a quarter-century of experience in attempting to establish some working relation with public education at mid-century Protestant religious education faces the fluid educational situation in which there is a nation-wide and deep conviction on the part of schoolmen as well as of religious leaders that the weakest point in American education is at the level of values, especially moral and spiritual values, and that something must be done to restore the value content to public education. For the first time since religion was excluded from the public schools in the nineteenth century the way seems to be opening, in ways yet to be worked out, for religion to become an integral part of the education of all the children and young people of the nation without violating the principle of the separation of church and state. In the Division of Christian Education the Protestant churches have a leadership which

by reason of academic training and experience is competent to sit down with public educators in searching for a satisfactory solution to this difficult and complex problem.

5. An outreach toward interfaith co-operation. The will to co-operate which resulted in the functional unification of Protestantism in the field of religious education and eventually in the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America over-runs the limits of Protestantism. This experience has not only created the desire for co-operation with the Catholic and Jewish faiths, but has demonstrated the possibility of achieving such co-operation around shared functions and responsibilities in the comprehending American society rather than fixing attention upon theological formulations and ecclesiastical polity and seeking to reduce the full-bodied religious experience of the three faiths to the sterilized generalizations and abstractions of minimum agreement.

Especially is the co-operation of the three faiths imperative in the light of the possibility of restoring the religious content to the total education of the whole child and youth population of the nation. This is a responsibility which none of these faiths can or should attempt alone. It is a shared responsibility which can only be discharged by understanding and effective interfaith co-operation. In increasing areas such co-operation has been shown to be feasible, as in the Whitehouse Conference on Children in a Democracy, in certain instances of Weekday Religious Education, and in schools of religion in connection with state universities as at the University of Iowa where Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic professors make up the faculty. On a national scale the National Conference of Christians and Jews is broadening the areas of understanding, tolerance, and co-operation among the historic expressions of our common religious heritage. This trend seems to justify the hope that in time religion, without minimizing its full-bodied differences of religious experience, may present a united front to the secularizing forces of contemporary American culture.

THE Westminster Press

Right and Wrong Ways to Use the Bible

BY J. CARTER SWAIM. Especially important in this day when a great new version makes it easier to *read* the Bible, this practical book shows how to avoid common pitfalls in the *use* of the Bible. It tells why we should search for the spirit of the Scriptures, and how Jesus Christ is the only infallible gauge for finding their true meaning.

RELIGIOUS BOOK CLUB SELECTION
\$2.50

Protestantism in America

A NARRATIVE HISTORY

BY JERALD C. BRAUER. The highly readable story of the Protestant Church in America from the days of the early Jamestown settlement in Virginia in 1607 through all of the exciting years until the present. Denying the view that Protestant church history can be told only as the separate stories of many denominations, Dr. Brauer weaves the histories of the separate churches into one dramatic narrative of American Protestantism.

COMING OCT. 19, \$3.50

At all bookstores
THE WESTMINSTER PRESS
Philadelphia 7



II

CATHOLIC EDUCATION IN THE U.S.A. IN 1953

FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT

Director, Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.

THE SIZE and scope of Catholic education in the United States comes as a surprise to most people, including many Catholics, even though they may have had some previous knowledge of the parochial school in their own locality. For the parochial school is only a segment of an educational program that involves literally millions of individuals and ranges from pre-school programs for infants to a complex schedule of education for adults in all walks of life. Why does this system of schooling exist and why do Catholics cherish it and make great sacrifices to protect and expand it? The answer is a very simple one. The Church is engaged in education for one purpose only—to make men saints, that is, to make them holy. The Church is following the divine admonition in helping mankind to achieve a supreme goal—"Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." The Church seeks by every educational device to bring men to the knowledge, love and service of God; it seeks to help men live decently and justly in this life so that they may enjoy the presence of God in eternity. Whatever else is done in educational endeavor must remain subordinate to the chief goal of bringing eternal salvation to men.

The purpose of education under Catholic auspices was clearly set down by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on the Christian Education of Youth, "to cooperate with divine grace in forming Christ in those regenerated by Baptism." It seems appropriate here to point out that the Church is a supernatural society, charged with the mandate of her divine Founder to go forth and teach all nations and to instruct according to His revelation. Monsignor George Johnson once observed that although the Church addresses herself immediately to the individual soul and strives there in cooperation with divine power to make those changes and transformations

which are in accordance with the standards of life and living as taught and exemplified by Christ, she is always mindful of the needs of society and of the advancement of human culture in all its phases. Father Gerald Walsh, S.J., speaking to the annual national meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association in 1948 put it this way:

"Obviously, then, we are conscious as American Catholic educators of our social responsibility in the concrete age in which we live. Without forgetting our responsibility to education as *education*, and to education as *Catholic*, we are remembering our responsibility to education as *contemporary*.

"But I hope we shall not forget, at any point in our discussions, that, however clearly we *distinguish* the aims, goals, tasks or responsibilities of Catholic education, we must not imagine we can *separate* them. Just as truly as we must distinguish without separating body and soul, person and community, tradition and progress, culture and civilization, ethics and economics, morality and legislation, religion and politics, church and society, God and the world, so we must distinguish without separation our threefold responsibility as educators.

"It would be fatal if we should imagine that our job is to give the world *either* scholars *or* citizens *or* saints. Our ideal is to give to our age and still more to the age that is in the womb of history, to the world of tomorrow, citizens who are *both* scholars *and* saints. On the other hand, it would be fatal if we should imagine that merely by making scholars and helping to make saints, we have done our whole task in forming good citizens. Good citizenship, or at any rate, high leadership in society is an autonomous function, and a specific end to be achieved by specific means."

Catholic educators and philosophers are one with Father Walsh on the question of

the interpenetration of our aims and responsibilities. We cannot separate our responsibility to citizenship from our responsibility to scholarship and holiness. Or as Father Walsh says:

"We shall, in fact, have better citizens and certainly better leaders of society if we have remained true to our ideal of education as education, to our task of disciplining the intelligence, conscience, taste and social sense of our students so that their minds can readily distinguish truth from falsehood; their conscience, right from wrong and justice from injustice; their taste, what is fair from what is foul; their social sense, what they owe to themselves as persons and what they owe to the society in which they live."

"We want our citizens to be scholars in the sense of persons disciplined in the human faculties that give them human dignity. Would like, too, our citizens to be saints in the sense of being always in the state of Grace, of having an habitual claim, in the theological sense, on the life of Eternal Glory, of being always aware of their immortal destiny."

"We want to give to our world of today and tomorrow men and women who think like Athenian philosophers, behave like the best citizens of ancient Rome and love God like those who stood by the Cross and prayed in the upper room in the Jerusalem of Jesus Christ."

It is a matter of historical record that the Church began her educational work in the territory of what is now the United States at the beginning of the Seventeenth Century in the Spanish colonies in the Southwest with a program that was more social and industrial than literary. From that day on she has built schools and colleges and fostered formal education in every possible way. And at the same time she has tried to keep alive the influence of Christian ideals in every phase of our national life.

Philosophers, skilled in the field of education have set down the philosophical bases of the Catholic doctrine of education and the educational bases of the Catholic philosophy of life. They have done this from a conviction that a mutual relationship exists be-

tween one's theory of education and one's philosophy of life. For every conception of life involves a theory of education, and every theory of education in turn is based on a philosophy of life. Because the Church has a definite concept of the nature of human beings and their destiny, it is consistent for her to develop definite fundamental principles concerning education. Although certain things may be emphasized at certain times there are common fundamental elements on which all philosophers of Catholic education base their speculations and these are the triple supernatural foundation of Catholic doctrine. The first of these emphasizes that God is the beginning and end of education. It is a fundamental Catholic principle that the soul of all education is the education of the soul. Religion is an essential element in the life of man and his education, therefore, must be essentially religious. Thus God is the cornerstone in the structure of Catholic education.

The second principle rests on the belief that the Living God has revealed Himself in the Living Christ. The Person of Christ who is the Way, the Truth and the Life, is the center of religious education. His educational significance lies first of all in the sublime nature of His Being. "The Word Made Flesh"—the Incarnation of the Son of God—is not only the central dogma of Christianity; it is also the central fact in the Catholic doctrine of education. The God who became Man in order that He might bring man to God is the life-giving principle of Catholic education. He is the Model for all educators. He is the inspiration and ultimate end of all educational endeavor.

The third principle of Catholic education that is basic is the doctrine that it is only through the Church that man can come to Christ and hence to God. The Church is the Mystical Body of the Savior. To be united with Him, the children of men must, according to His own pronouncement, be incorporated in that Body. Thus the Incarnation, as has been said, is the central dogma of Catholic faith and of Catholic education. But Christ has not ceased to be with man. He continues to live in the Church, not only in the Sacrament of the Altar, but in the teachings of the

Church, in its Visible Head, and in every soul that is sanctified by His grace. Thus the Church of Christ becomes a connecting link between man and God, between time and eternity, and between the natural and the supernatural.

The Catholic School System

The history of the beginnings and early development of the parochial schools in the United States has been treated at great length by the Rev. J. A. Burns and Dr. Bernard Kohlbrenner. For our purposes here, however, it is necessary to review certain outstanding happenings that relate directly to modern developments in the Catholic system. As was mentioned earlier mission schools were established in the Southwest and in Florida as a result of Spanish influence. The foundations of Catholic education in the English-speaking colonies were laid in Maryland. Jesuit priests who accompanied the first settlers developed formal schools and other means of education. Usually a school went hand in hand with a mission development thus laying the foundation for the parish-school system that now flourishes in the United States.

The importance of the school for the work of the Church was recognized as early as 1829 when the Bishops of the country met at Baltimore for their first provincial council. There they said: "We judge it absolutely necessary that schools should be established in which the young may be taught the principles of faith and morality while being instructed in letters." Although schools had been developing at a good pace it was this decision taken by the Bishops that gave impetus to a movement that is still a distinctive feature of Catholic life in America. After 1829 more teachers were needed and there came to America in good numbers from all over Europe the religious orders of men and women who by their dedicated efforts spread the faith and the schools in a magnificent missionary undertaking.

Between 1829 and 1884 when the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore took place the growth of Catholic schools was a steady process especially in large city areas where the

Catholic population tended to center. The growth in size, however, did not connote any definite pattern of procedures. It was evident the only uniformity lay in the basic law of the Church that the Bishop is responsible for the conduct of Catholic education in his diocese. In order to establish some uniformity and to insure that Catholic schools would be able to meet current educational standards some dioceses established school boards. The Third Council liked the device and decreed that it should be adopted as a means of supervision. Eventually, however, the school board lost its first importance and became merely an advisory body. The chief task of administration and supervision of education was delegated by the Bishop in most cases to a diocesan school superintendent or secretary for education. Between 1889 and 1910 more than a dozen dioceses appointed school superintendents including New York, Philadelphia, Omaha, Pittsburgh, Brooklyn, Fort Wayne, Boston, Hartford, Cincinnati, Green Bay and others.

It was no easy task for the early Bishops of the United States to provide at once for the religious and educational needs of their people. During the period of 1830-1920 hundreds of thousands of Catholic immigrants entered the country. It is estimated that from nine to ten millions would represent the Catholic immigrational increase up to the end of 1920. When this increase, natural growth and conversions throughout the land were combined, the total in 1920 was an estimated twenty million Catholics in a total population of almost 106 million people. It was a notable growth considering the fact that it began in 1830 with an estimated Catholic population of 318,000 souls.

In 1830 there were eleven dioceses and about 232 priests in the country. By 1870, fifty-four dioceses of which seven were metropolitan sees and six vicariates had already been founded. In this same year a total Catholic population of four and one-half millions was cared for by 3,780 priests.

Up to 1840 at least two hundred schools had been erected, more than half of which were located west of the Alleghenies. In 1920 the Catholic school enrollment had

risen to 1,970,507, about 1.8 per cent of the entire population.

The growth of the Catholic schools was intimately related to the office of the school superintendent, usually a priest, especially prepared for his task. Word of the successful operation of the diocesan schools of Philadelphia under a superintendent in the late 1880's got around and did much to encourage other dioceses to imitate a successful pattern. As a professional footnote, one must take note of the influence of the Department of Education of the Catholic University of America which opened in 1905 with the express purpose of training diocesan superintendents. The courses in those early days included: the Science and Art of Study, Psychology of Education, Special Methods, Philosophy of Education and History of Education. Later courses in Administration and Supervision were added.

The work of the superintendent has been made meaningful and professional by the cooperation and collaboration of the various religious communities teaching in the dioceses. These groups appoint supervisors for the schools in which their communities teach and these supervisors work under the direction of the Superintendent.

The early parochial schools like the present ones provided an education in all the secular subjects normally found in the public school curriculum plus special classes in religious instruction that centered around the teaching of a catechism of Christian Doctrine and Bible history. Teaching Christian Doctrine provided likewise an opportunity for instruction in sacred music, hymns, and Christian art, and the liturgy. The instruction in the sacred and religious subjects was of a quality proportionate to the training of the classroom teachers and the zeal and professional background of the supervisors and the superintendent.

Pedagogically speaking, the teaching of the Catechism over the years has been a controversial issue. Conservative educators making much of the value of training the memory have often been at issue with other teachers about the rote learning of Catechism. They felt that with adequate explanations

before and after the memorizing process that it was essential to memorize the Catechism in sequence and to be able to respond verbatim to the standard questions with fixed answers. Others insisted that teaching for comprehension was the prime requisite and that the teacher should never require from the student a verbatim repetition of something he could not comprehend. Sometimes, in the dispute the Catechism itself was the loser and the little booklets in graded series sometimes fell into disfavor for reasons that had no connection really with the inherent worth of the volume.

It would be difficult to give the Catechism the praise that it deserves as a teaching medium over the centuries. From an ugly duckling of printed questions and answers the Catechism in America has developed into a beautiful, well-illustrated handbook that no longer causes foreboding to the child or the student with its highly formalized approach. No matter how methods and texts improve or change, it seems safe to say that the Catechism will remain the core of teaching methods for Christian Doctrine.

As catechisms have improved many fine teaching helps have been added to some editions such as graphs and symbolic illustrations, diagnostic tests after each lesson, references from the New Testament, previews before each lesson, index of words used throughout the study and phoneticized word study before each lesson. In general the new texts are adaptable for use in elementary schools, high schools, parish study clubs, Catholic youth organization programs, released-time classes, and private study.

Until the 1930's the Catechism (with the Bible History) was undoubtedly the most distinctively Catholic text placed in the hands of the child in the parochial school. The other texts, with few exceptions, looked like and for that matter were, the same textbooks found in the nearby public school. There were a few exceptions such as a Catholic reader or history text, or some small supplementary texts of special reading material. But usually the books were public school books with something added or subtracted to make them palatable or at least acceptable to

Catholic authorities. Sometimes these books were referred to, in jest, as "baptized versions" and many agreed that the term was appropriate. The lack of good Catholic texts and the absence of a good scientific basic curriculum and course of study led some critics of the parochial schools to refer to them as mere public schools plus the Catechism. The need for making the parochial schools Catholic in the most ideal sense of the term troubled scholars over the years. At the Catholic University of America the problem became one of special concern to Dr. Shields and Dr. Pace. Their discussions and concern were reflected in a brilliant student of theirs, Monsignor George Johnson, who was to serve as the inspiration and first director of the Commission on American Citizenship.

The Commission on American Citizenship

In 1938, Pope Pius XI sent to the American Hierarchy a letter remarkable for its foresight, its wisdom and its results. This Apostolic Letter written upon the occasion of the Golden Jubilee of the Catholic University, did not merely congratulate the University upon its historic attainments. It called upon the University to assume "greater and more momentous responsibilities" than it had undertaken in the past. The needs of our times, the Holy Father pointed out, require the giving of special attention to the social sciences in order that it might be possible to bring to bear upon the pressing problems of our time Christian principles of justice and charity.

The Holy Father reminded the Bishops and the University that because the University was Catholic, it had the traditional mission of guarding the natural and supernatural heritage of man. It must, then, give special attention to the sciences of civics, sociology and economics. It must evolve, on the basis of study and research, a constructive program of social action, fitting in its details to local needs, which would command the admiration and acceptance of all right-thinking men.

As a result of this request the Hierarchy of the United States called upon the University to establish a program of social education upon all levels. The request said in part:

"To carry out the injunction of the Holy Father it is necessary that our people, from childhood to mature age, be ever better instructed in the true nature of Christian democracy. A precise definition must be given to them both of democracy in the light of Christian truth and tradition and of the rights and duties of citizens in a representative Republic such as our own. They must be held to the conviction that love of country is a virtue and that disloyalty is a sin.

"To foster this Christian concept of citizenship the Bishops in their annual meeting have charged the Catholic University of America to compile at once a more comprehensive series of graded texts for all educational levels. On the foundation of religious training, which is the distinctive characteristic of our schools, these texts will build an enlightened, conscientious American citizenship."

The Rector of the University accepted the mandate for the institution in these words:

"The Catholic University of America pledges itself to this great task which the Holy Father declares dear to him. The enemies of God and of right government have known well how to center their efforts and their hopes on the youth of the nation. Shall we be less wise? To train a generation in true Christian democracy means that the elementary school room must begin the task. It must be carried through secondary schools and keep pace with the developing mind of the future citizen."

Three members of the faculty with Monsignor George Johnson in direct authority over matters pertaining to education organized the Commission on American Citizenship—a structure broad enough, deep enough, and strong enough to fulfill its purpose in the teaching of citizenship. Since it was important that the program meet the highest educational standards, an advisory committee of scholars, distinguished in educational work, particularly in the social sciences was brought together. Cooperating committees were formed of the Diocesan Superintendents of Schools, supervisors of

social studies in various dioceses, and the faculty of the school of social science and of the department of education at the University.

The work of the Commission has fallen into three general divisions—an informational service to educators, Catholic and non-Catholic, of its principles, aims and methods; instruction for Catholic school teachers by means of a Curriculum for Guiding Growth in Christian Social Living; and instruction for Catholic school students by means of a series of basal readers and other textbooks.

The Commission, at the very start, decided upon two activities to launch the program: The production of a curriculum for the elementary schools whose purpose would be the development in the school child of the understandings, the attitudes, and the habits that are required for Christian living in American society; the writing of a series of basal readers for the grades to accompany and implement the curriculum. Both products were to be closely integrated with religion, with the goal to make the learner aware of all that the dogma and doctrines of the Church require of him in the way of civic and social virtue.

The goals were very practical ones indeed for the whole project was designed to implement the philosophy of Catholic education (to which reference was made earlier) in such a way that the students in our schools would become more and more aware of the intimate relationship between the love of God and the love of fellowman. Here, at last, was a sound pedagogical approach to help boys and girls put the truth they had learned in their religious classes into their lives at home, in the classroom, on the playground and in the larger community.

Certain basic principles guided the work of the curriculum and the readers. These included:

The dependence of man upon God
The individual dignity of every human person
The social nature of man
The sacredness and integrity of the family
The dignity of the worker and his work
The material and spiritual interdependence of all men
The obligation of all men to use the re-

sources of the earth according to God's plan

The obligation of men to share non-material goods with one another

The obligation of justice and charity that exists between peoples and nations

The unity of all men

The curriculum has been organized into three volumes and published by the Catholic University Press. The material has been graded for three levels, primary, intermediate, and upper grades. Each of the three volumes present the guided experience of the child under the direction of the school. All of the volumes stress the individual growth of each child toward five goals: physical fitness, economic competency, social virtue, cultural development, moral perfection. All of them take into account the child's basic relationships: God, the Church, fellowman, nature, self.

The curriculum has won the interest and support of educators and is widely used as the basic document in many dioceses; in others it forms the point of departure for local research, experimentation and teacher training. Regional and diocesan studies have been completed or are in progress that take their direct inspiration from the curriculum. Many of the teaching religious communities have set up special committees to associate their normal school training with the basic plan of the curriculum. Hundreds of institutes have been held throughout the nation with the staff of the Commission serving as speakers and discussion leaders. Publishers and authors of text books have sought the counsel and guidance of the Commission in the production of materials that are related to the philosophy of the curriculum. It is difficult to weigh the tremendous influence of the curriculum on the American Catholic educational scene. Moreover its influence has reached out to Europe and Latin America and Canada where similar curriculum projects have been launched. The influence of the curriculum designed by the Commission will truly be world-wide.

Just as the Curriculum on *Guiding Growth in Christian Social Living* was designed to

help the Catholic elementary school teacher in understanding the social teaching of the Church so, too, the *Faith and Freedom Series* of basal readers were published to implant these principles in the mind of the Catholic student as a guide for use in daily life. Based on the principles integrated in the Curriculum, these Readers were written for the purpose of establishing in the child understandings and attitudes which would determine his behavior both as a student and as an adult. Their construction was based on a plan quite opposite from that of most readers used in Catholic schools, a method which merely added a few Catholic stories, essays and poems to readers already in use in the public schools. The Readers were developed according to the child's growing consciousness, starting with his first impressions of home and family and working outward to the world at large. The titles convey a clear idea of this plan: *This is Our Home, This is Our Family, These are Our Friends, These are Our Neighbors, This is Our Town, This is Our Land, These are Our People, This is Our Heritage, These are Our Freedoms, These are Our Horizons.*

As a corollary to the basal readers the Commission has produced a series of books to present literature at the various grade levels. Manuals, workbooks and various teachers' aid have been developed. Special materials dealing with war relief and famine have been designed for use in school; materials dealing with peace and international understandings have been written.

The staff of the Commission is now at work on a curriculum for the secondary schools which will be a natural sequel to the work that has gone before. Some experimental work on a college curriculum has been launched in the field. All in all the work of the Commission has had a most profound influence on the development of Catholic educational procedures in America. The full import of this great undertaking will only be appreciated by the educational historian a half century or so from now, but even in the short years from 1939 until the present it is evident that something wonderful has slowly been accomplished.

The National Catholic Education Association

In 1953-54 the National Catholic Educational Association is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. The Association was founded 1904 and came into being as a result of national meetings of Catholic colleges and seminaries which began in 1897. The Association is a voluntary organization of all who are interested in the welfare of Catholic education. It includes both individual and institutional members.

Its purpose is to keep in the minds of the people the necessity of religious instruction and training as a basis of morality and sound education, to promote the principles and safeguard the interests of Catholic education in all its departments, to encourage a spirit of cooperation and mutual helpfulness among Catholic educators, to promote by study, conference and discussion the thoroughness of Catholic educational work in the United States and to help the cause of Catholic education by the publication and circulation of appropriate materials.

Since 1904 the Association has grown steadily in size and influence. Its original three departments, College, Parish School, and Seminary have expanded to six which include Major Seminary, Minor Seminary, College and University, Secondary Schools, School Superintendents, Elementary Schools and two sections: Education for the Blind, Education for the Deaf. These last two sections will in the near future be absorbed into a new department of Special Education which will provide, in addition an opportunity to study the exceptional child.

With the exception of 1943 and 1945 the Association has held annual meetings in which all the departments take an active part and at which papers are read and perennial problems together with those of prevailing interest are discussed. Each convention produces papers of outstanding merit and the fifty volumes that now make up the published proceedings constitute a valuable record of Catholic educational thought since the beginning of the century.

The College and University department has established six regional units: Eastern,

Midwest, New England, Northwestern, Southern, and Southwestern. The Secondary School department has five regional units: California, Hawaii, Middle Atlantic, Midwest and Southern. The regional units of these two departments meet separately at regular intervals. This arrangement enables the Association to serve more definitely the interests of its members, and allows likewise for a better discussion and study of local problems.

The official organ of the N.C.E.A. is the quarterly publication, *The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*. It appears in February, May, August and November. The August issue contains the proceedings and addresses of the annual meeting. The other issues contain monographs and special papers of general and timely interest. In recent months the subject matter has ranged over a wide educational area including, teaching Catholic history, higher education for women, school discipline, the faculty and the curriculum, teacher accreditation, student exchange, the Fulbright program, international understanding, and reports on international educational conferences.

An N.C.E.A. *News Letter* is sent to all members and a specially designed series of *News Notes* are made available to College presidents and their staffs. The College and University Department issues a *College Newsletter*, the Secondary School Department publishes *The Catholic High School Quarterly Bulletin*, and the Elementary School Department publishes *The Catholic Educational News Digest*.

The Association has watched closely the formation and continuation of the UNESCO program; it sponsored the initiation of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs; it continues to take an active part in the annual meetings as well as the year around program of the American Council on Education, and the Association of American Colleges. The Association is called upon frequently to work with the staff of the United States Office of Education as well as with the representatives of other government agencies.

Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities

The largest segment in the Catholic school system is, of course, the elementary school. It is estimated that in 1952 (final statistics were not quite complete when this article was written) there were 9064 elementary schools with a faculty of 70,515 teachers, 65,484 of whom were religious, that is members of religious communities. The earliest survey of the Department of Education, NCWC showed that in 1920 there were 6551 Catholic elementary schools. By 1950 this number had increased to 8589, an increase of 31.1 per cent. It is interesting to note that a 5.5 per cent increase is expected for the two year period of 1950 to 1952.

In 1920 there were 1,970,507 young students in Catholic elementary schools. By 1952 that number had increased to 2,791,288.

In nearly all cases the parochial schools are, as their name implies, parish schools under the immediate control of the pastor and supported by the free will donations of parish members. These schools follow in most cases a course of study worked out by diocesan committees with community supervisors under the direction of the diocesan school superintendent. In this regard, as was mentioned in an earlier section of this report, the influence of the curriculum designed by the Commission on American Citizenship has been increasingly notable since 1942. In many dioceses students in the parish schools are requested to meet periodic examinations prepared either by the diocese or by competent research and testing groups located in Catholic universities, or in special institutes around the country. Textbook adoptions have become uniform through most dioceses. Research in text book construction has improved greatly among publishers who have done and continue to do special work for the Catholic school system. Among publishers the past ten year period has discovered new strength and new forces in companies that have been traditional producers of texts for Catholic schools; there has been noted too a marked increase in the number of Catholic departments among companies that produce

textbooks. All of these advances have greatly profited the Catholic school system.

It is obvious that the great majority of teachers in the Catholic elementary schools are members of religious communities. It has been advanced that one reason for this is that Catholic schools have to be self-supporting and consequently there are many areas of the country where it would be difficult to furnish adequate compensation for lay teachers, who certainly ought to be paid at the going rate for comparably prepared teachers in the public school system. The members of the religious communities contribute their services asking little more in return than their sustenance. The magnificent growth of the Catholic school system is in large measure the direct result of the willing self-sacrifice of the thousands of men and women who have entered the religious life to give themselves to the dedicated task of teaching our youth.

Today as in the past the preparation of teachers for the schools remains for the most part the duty of the separate religious communities. Dioceses, through the superintendent and the school board, take an increasingly larger interest in the kind and type of teacher training carried on by the various communities. Standards set by state and regional accrediting groups likewise have a large measure of influence in the training program. Considerable influence is exerted by the research carried on by Catholic universities and institutes in the educational field. Our Catholic schools like to regard themselves as self-starters in improving educational content and procedures; they do not want to feel that they are slavishly dependent on state, or other standards, or merely on the current developments in public education.

Although the diocesan authorities in the field of education work closely today with the religious communities there is not observable a trend towards an increase in diocesan teachers colleges. Some years ago it was predicted that such a trend would develop. The pattern, however, remains as described above, a mutual sharing of the re-

sponsibility and a cooperative desire on the part of the religious communities to meet the desired standards. Originally the Third Council of Baltimore stipulated that the candidates must take a diocesan examination. Today this is interpreted nearly everywhere, to mean that the dioceses will accept the credits and teacher preparation of reputable colleges and universities. It is still a custom in many places to require the school board to pass upon the list of newly assigned teachers in a given diocese.

One of the unsolved problems of the present is the identification and preparation of sufficient teachers to staff a rapidly expanding system. Religious teachers, completely prepared, are not always available to satisfy the need. There are good programs being carried on to encourage vocations to the religious teaching life but admittedly this is a slow process and cannot meet the immediate requirements. The answer seems to lie in the greater use of lay teachers. This solution passes the problem along to the parents who must grow accustomed to the greater use of the laity in schools that have been traditionally staffed by religious teachers, and, who must too, pick up a larger tab for school expenses since it will be required of them to pay the lay teacher a stipend comparable to that received by public school teachers of like experience and preparation.

In 1952 there were 2282 Catholic secondary schools in the United States. About fifty percent of these are conducted under parish auspices; another approximate thirty-four percent are academies conducted by religious communities. The balance are central high schools under diocesan direction. Private academies and many parish high schools are maintained by tuition fees, although in many parish high schools part of the cost to the student is provided from parish funds set aside for this purpose. The central high schools receive their support from the diocese in which they are located or from the parishes from which the students attend.

The first survey of Catholic secondary schools was made in 1915 by the Catholic Educational Association, at which time the

enrollment was 75,000. In 1938 the enrollment was 300,000, an increase of 290 percent in twenty-five years. A comprehensive survey of Catholic secondary schools was undertaken in 1947 by Sister Janet, S. C., at the invitation of the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Sister Janet found that from 1920, when the first N.C.W.C. study was undertaken, until 1947, the number of secondary schools had increased from 1552 to 2111, an increase of 36 percent. The increase in the number of pupils from 129,848 to 467,039 represented a 259.8 percent rise. The greater growth of the student body is explained by consolidation of schools and by additions made to existing facilities. Of the 2111 schools 53.6 percent were coeducational, 33.6 percent schools for girls, and 12.8 percent for boys. It is interesting to note the composition of the staff in 1947. Seventy-one and two-tenths percent were women, and of this number only 7.4 per cent were lay women. Twenty-eight and eight-tenths percent were men divided in the following way: 7.3 percent diocesan priests, 7.3 percent teaching brothers, 6.6 percent priests members of religious orders, 6.4 percent laymen and 1.2 percent seminarians. The total number of teachers in all secondary schools was 27,216 which represented an increase of 10.7 percent since the year 1944.

In 1952 the total enrollment in Catholic secondary schools had rolled past the 500,000 mark to 551,072 with about 50,000 more girls than boys in attendance. This was a trend clearly indicated by Sister Janet's study.

What goes on in these schools? What is their curriculum like? Sister Janet's study answered these questions with a careful analysis of the types of program offered: comprehensive, academic, commercial, technical, agricultural, or vocational. Schools were asked to label themselves as "academic" only if they gave credit for nothing except the so called academic subjects. The term "comprehensive" to be most accurately applied would be given only to those schools which could offer programs sufficiently varied to meet the present and future needs of all classes of students — those preparing

for colleges, professional and technical schools, nursing schools and the like; those preparing for skilled and unskilled occupations; those preparing for other types of occupations; as well as providing preparation for home life and leisure pursuits. Although many of the schools do not meet fully the objectives of the comprehensive school, still, the attempt to differentiate according to varieties of needs justifies the classification as distinct from the strictly academic or college preparatory institutions. According to their own classification, then, the schools listed themselves as 64.4 percent comprehensive, 31.6 percent academic, 3.8 percent commercial and 0.2 percent vocational. Undoubtedly the cost of maintaining vocational schools is the major factor. It is encouraging to note a wider appeal for students under the heading "comprehensive," for in the late 1930's the preponderance would certainly have been on the purely academic side. To some educators this seems like a retreat from glory, but Sister Janet made it quite clear which side she was on when she said:

"The crux of the problem today is found in the program of studies. Here there is urgent need of reorientation, in which the guide will be Christian social principles and in which present needs will exert influence at least commensurate with the importunities of the past. Throughout the year Catholic schools in general have moved slowly in departure from the traditional courses of study. This is explained probably by our firm belief in fundamental unchanging truths, essential to our whole concept of man in his origin and destiny. Catholic educational practice in guarding what is essentially unalterable — belief in God, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, the truths of Faith, fixed principles of morality — may fail to distinguish that certain centuries-old phases of the school curriculum such as the classical tradition to which we have clung for many centuries are not part of the fundamental body of unchangeable truth. Having initiated secondary education in the form of selective schools requiring such a program, we have continued to use it for so long that, in spite of the passing of selectivity, there remain many Catholics who apparently

believe that the academic tradition is the very heart and soul of Catholic education. Actually there is nothing of fundamental Christian truth in the study of the classics. There is, however, fundamental Christian truth in the ideal of respecting all types of human abilities, talents, and interests, and in helping to educate youths for Christian family life and Christian occupations in addition to educating the potential scholars.

"This is not to imply in any sense that the classical tradition has no contribution to make. It definitely has. But it is certain that it cannot continue to monopolize the respect of educators, who accordingly, have nothing but condescension for what they consider unworthy materials for educational purposes."

Sister Janet ends her study with a plea for experimental research on a national scale, chiefly by the college and university departments of the National Catholic Educational Association. She feels that another Eight-Year Study is needed, in which Catholic colleges may cooperate with high schools in a real attempt to solve the problem of articulation between the two levels in education. Catholic education needs to be roused to the fact that the power of religion has not been fully used for many years in the compartmentalized curriculums which have resulted from the extremes of electivism. Religion has been correlated throughout, but real integration has not appeared.

Upon the firm foundation of their elementary and secondary schools American Catholics have built a system of colleges and universities rivaled by no other Catholic group in any country of the world. The 1952 survey of N.C.W.C. shows 215 institutions of higher learning. Eighty-one of these are conducted for men and 134 for women. This total includes 30 universities for men, 48 four-year colleges and 3 junior colleges for men; 1 university for women, 112 four-year colleges and 21 junior colleges for women.

The first Catholic college was established in colonial days at Newton in Maryland in 1677. This institution subsequently became Georgetown University. Today there are more than thirty Catholic universities and colleges that have celebrated their centenary.

Catholic colleges and universities for men reported total faculties of 12,318 of which 8,684 were lay men. The lay man has come into his own as a teacher at the college level. The total student population in colleges for men in 1952 was 189,890. In colleges for women there were 65,201 students taught by a faculty of 5,502 of whom 1,730 were lay men or lay women.

Although the liberal arts tradition is a strong one in Catholic institutions of higher learning many of these institutions now offer professional or special courses ranging from agriculture to social work, with a wide variety of subject areas such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, journalism, law, library science, medicine, nursing or nursing education, pharmacy, and physical education. ROTC units are available in many Catholic colleges and universities.

Catholic colleges and universities have been moving slowly but steadily into the graduate level not only in arts and science but in engineering, social work, and other areas. In late years the organization of the colleges and universities has been under close scrutiny with an eye towards better integration with religion, philosophy and theology. The investigations in these areas are basically not too different from those undertaken by the Commission on American Citizenship for the lower levels. There is one basic difference; however, the researchers at the college level have no continuing national focus such as the Commission provides, but depend upon the initiative of the various institutions for their vitality and endurance. Happily the interest in such research is growing and one college after another reports solid progress in seeking the goal of integration of subject matter, philosophy and program.

The picture at the college level would be incomplete without some mention of the work of Diocesan teachers colleges and normal training schools. In all there are 27 such institutions enrolling 7,286 students of whom more than 6,500 are women. It is in these institutions that the young members of the religious communities secure their basic training as teachers.

There is no Catholic accrediting agency for institutions of higher learning, the colleges and universities generally conform to the requirements of the regional accrediting agencies.

At the pinnacle of the Catholic educational system stand the major and minor seminaries in which students are trained for the priesthood. In these institutions a very high level of scholarship maintains and the students may prepare themselves not only for parish and religious life, but for a life of deep learning and scholarship as well. The major and minor seminaries combine to form a total of 291 institutions providing for 28,690 young men seeking theological wisdom and eventual ordination to the priesthood. The major seminary courses are built around the care of dogmatic and moral theology and scripture. Additional work in graduate philosophy, history, Church history, social sciences, language, liturgy, speech and religious education, especially catechetics, round out a carefully designed program that serves both the scholar and the parish priest. In the minor seminary the basic liberal arts course with a special emphasis on philosophy, introduction to scripture, apologetics and introductory liturgy are the main ingredients in what is generally regarded as a rather stiff course. The faculties of the seminaries are usually priests specially prepared for their assignments in graduate theological schools here and abroad.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine

Thus far this overview of Catholic education has dealt with the formal school system as such and has accounted for 3,633,427 students carrying on their educational endeavors under 121,651 teachers. This, of course, does not account for the balance of the educable young people who are Catholics. What of them, this balance who are not in Catholic schools? They are not neglected. The responsibility for their religious education as well as for that of another large part of the population falls under the care of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

What is this Confraternity? It is the lay apostolate in action under the guidance of the clergy. The Confraternity exists that

Catholics may learn more and more about their religion, thus teaching themselves as well as others the knowledge and love of God.

The objectives of the Confraternity have been set down as follows. Religious education of elementary school children not attending Catholic schools, in vacation schools, instruction classes, and correspondence courses; religious instruction of Catholic youth of high school age not attending Catholic schools; religious discussion clubs for adult groups, including students attending secular colleges and universities, and out of school youth; religious education of children by parents in the home; instruction of non-Catholics in the faith; participation as a society, and under the direction of the pastor in function of public worship, such as the annual celebration of Catechetical Day as prescribed by the Bishop of the Diocese.

Although it has not been possible to obtain exact figures on the number of Catholics in public schools some conjectures are in order. Some estimate that there are between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 Catholic students in public elementary schools, and, perhaps, another 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 in public high schools. It is also estimated that there are 300,000 Catholic students in secular colleges.

It is immediately apparent that the need to supply religious instruction for all Catholics in non-Catholic institutions is a grave one. Moreover, on the adult level there are many thousands of men and women who know little of their faith or who are inconsistent or wanting in the practice of it. Some of these because of the lack of their own religious knowledge, fail to pass on the basic truths of religion to their children. All of these needs represent the work of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

By 1951 the Confraternity was able to report that eight national and fifty-four regional conferences have been held in the United States since 1935. New problems, in addition to the ones mentioned above, are constantly arising and additional personnel as well as new materials, methods and techniques must be found. This is especially true in the field of religious instruction. Because of this, the Confraternity has intensified its

activity in the hope of bringing to adults and children of all ages and of all walks of life a better knowledge of their religion.

To accomplish this, the Confraternity has encouraged the establishment in various parts of the country or preparatory courses for lay teachers of religion, fishers (home visitors) helpers, and discussion club leaders. It has also placed emphasis on the preparation of parents for the home religious instruction of their children (parent-educators) and has stimulated progress in the apostolate of good will to non-Catholics.

The regional or provincial congress has been found to be a most effective means of spreading knowledge of the existence of these courses, of acquainting people with materials, methods and techniques which are most effective in learning and teaching religious truth. Since 1939, twenty of the twenty-two ecclesiastical provinces of the United States have held one or more regional conferences; in all fifty-four conferences have convened. At the ten regional conferences held in 1949, twenty-five thousand four hundred and eighty-nine official delegates registered. These included members of the hierarchy, priests, religious and interested laity.

The regional conferences have made a determined effort to assess the actual conditions of religious instruction which may handicap or hinder the pastor of souls in carrying out the teaching of Christian doctrine.

In 1950 the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine carried out a mid-century survey of its activities in the United States. Many interesting facts come to light. Ninety-nine dioceses have organized a program of religious instruction for public school children as a required activity in each parish. Thirty-eight dioceses engage in a released or dismissed time program. One hundred and eleven dioceses conduct religious vacation schools. Forty give preparatory courses to lay teachers of religion. Sixty-four make use of helper and home visitors. Eighty-three have canonically erected the Confraternity in all parishes. One hundred and twenty have appointed a Diocesan Director for Confraternity work. In the adult instruction field seventy-eight dioceses have inquiry classes,

ninety-four have religious discussion clubs, and forty-five have a parent-educator program.

The Confraternity is a vital program carried on by an interested and dedicated committee of Bishops who have inspired the laity and the religious to do magnificent work in the field of religious instruction. The program planned for the future gives every indication of surpassing the great record made up to this time. Many Catholic colleges encourage students to undertake part time activities in this field as a part of their own regular religious training.

*The National Catholic Welfare Conference
An Expression of Unified Faith*

The National Catholic Welfare Conference was founded in 1919 as an outgrowth of the National Catholic War Council, which co-ordinated the welfare activities of the Church during the World War I. It was started by the Bishops of the United States to promote Christian life in the nation and to further the cause of Christ and His Church throughout the world. In the larger sense of that concept it is a tremendous program of adult education. Its object has been to unify, coordinate and organize Catholic programs of education, social welfare, immigrant aid, citizenship and other activities. The Conference is administered by a board of ten Archbishops and Bishops, elected each year at the annual meeting of the Hierarchy.

Originally the N.C.W.C. consisted of six departments: Education, Legal, Social Action, Lay Organizations, Press and Executive Department. Its founders described the N.C.W.C. as "the Church in the United States at work on matters of general import, under the direction of the Bishops. Its aim, they said, was to act as a guide and helper, its purpose being only to exercise "a moral influence." In 1940 a Youth Department was added, and in 1953 activities in the interest of immigrants became known as the Immigration Department.

The twice yearly meetings of its administrative board has carried on its work by the appointment of numerous committees which include the Committee on the American

Board of Catholic Missions, the Committee on the Propagation of the Faith, the Committee on the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, the Committee on Seminaries, the Committee on Motion Pictures, the Committee on Indecent Literature, the Committee on the Pope's Peace Pacts, and the Committee on War Emergency and Relief.

This last named committee has involved a tremendous expenditure of time and money. The Bishop's War Emergency and Relief Committee was organized shortly after the outbreak of World War II and shortly became such a large activity that it brought into existence in 1943 an agency charged with giving aid to distressed peoples—War Relief Services. This agency has brought help and comfort to suffering and homeless people around the world. Programs of aid to distressed groups of exiles were begun as soon as the problem of displaced persons became evident. The continuing problem of displaced persons and expelled peoples was a challenge which called for a great resettlement achievement by the Catholic Church in the United States. At the same time, aid in the form of clothing, food and medicines has been channeled to people still suffering from the effects of war.

American Catholics have been outstanding in their contribution to the millions of helpless Korean civilians rendered destitute and homeless by the conflict there. Crises, still unsolved, as a consequence of World War II, have demanded financial aid from American Catholics. Funds needed to carry on worldwide aid in resettlement are gathered in a special campaign conducted by parishes during the Lenten season.

The National Catholic Community Service as a member of USO serves millions of men and women in the armed services, and as a member agency of United Community Defense Services provides for the special needs of defense-production workers in over-crowded communities throughout the United States.

The Department of Education, N.C.W.C. is not an administrative body; it possesses no control over Catholic schools, and it functions only in the capacity of an advisory agency.

Each diocesan school system is an independent unit. Consequently the word "system" in connection with Catholic education is used only in its widest connotation. Any solidarity of program results from voluntary cooperation among superintendents and stems from programs initiated at their twice-yearly meetings.

The Department does not prepare courses of study nor does it deal in the over-all problem of curriculum. It serves as the medium by which Catholic school systems can exchange points of view, educational materials, and other forms of assistance. The chief reason for its existence continues to be the cooperation with all movements looking to the improvement of Catholic education whether they find their origin in local, state, or national organizations.

The Department of Education has four chief functions: (1) To supply information concerning Catholic education to Catholics and to the general public, (2) to serve as an advisory agency in the development of Catholic schools, (3) to act as a connecting agency between Catholic educational activities and governmental educational agencies, and (4) to safeguard the interests of Catholic schools.

There are six sections in the Department, each devoted to some special phase of education: research and information, statistics, teachers registration and placement (college and university level only), library service, educational liaison with all agencies, and an exchange of persons section. This last activity in recent years has emphasized a program with Germany and Austria, including adults as well as secondary and college students.

The Press Department has developed the N.C.W.C. News Service, which occupies a place in Catholic journalism similar to that of the Associated Press and other international news-gathering agencies in the field of secular journalism. This service provides approximately 60,000 words a week of national and international news, a feature service offering articles of interest to a wide variety of readers, and picture service illustrating the Catholic events of the world. The News Service supplies the needs of the Catholic

press in Canada and the United States and has subscribers in fifty-four countries and dependencies. There is also a Spanish-Portuguese language service which is sent to every country in Latin America.

The Social Action Department concentrates its work on the dissemination of Church principles in industrial relations, international peace and rural life. The Family Life Bureau, one of the activities of the Department conducts annual national conferences on family life and makes its researches in this area generally available. The Social Action Department sponsors conferences on industrial problems for employees and workers, schools of social action for the clergy, and lectures, articles, and radio addresses on Catholic social action. The Catholic Association for International Peace, a part of this Department, is dedicated to the study and application of Christian principles in the broad field of international relations. Another division of the Social Action Department is the Bureau of Health and Hospitals which serves as an agency of liaison with the Catholic Hospital Association, and which coordinates the work of diocesan representatives for hospital affairs.

A clearing house of information on legislation enacted or pending in Congress, and in State Legislatures affecting the Church or Christian life is provided by the Legal Department. This Department analyzes legislation and court decisions concerning matters of social and religious interest and provides information and advice to Catholic groups and institutions. It presents the Catholic point of view on legislation and represents Catholic charitable and welfare institutions before administrative agencies of government.

The Youth Department is one of the newer agencies of the Welfare Conference but it boasts of a complex program involving religious, social, and recreational programs, vocational guidance and cultural activities of Catholic youth groups throughout the nation. Nearly every diocese has a youth director and has organized a program of activities at the parish level. These activities are coordinated

by the National Federation of Diocesan Catholic Youth Activities.

The College and University section of this Department includes the Newman Club Federation, 550 clubs at secular educational institutions, and the National Federation of Catholic College Students, a membership of 205 Catholic Colleges.

These three federations constitute the National Council of Catholic Youth.

The newest department of N.C.W.C. is dedicated to the interest of immigrants and certain problems of emigrants. The chief problems involve citizenship and naturalization. Currently, one of the chief centers of attention is the problem of refugees. In addition this Department facilitates the reunion of families separated through immigration difficulties. It maintains branch offices in New York and the Mexican border.

One of the newer additions to the N.C.W.C. family is the Mission Secretariat of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. It assists all Catholic mission-sending societies with American members in the field. In addition it provides field data to these groups, and provides likewise mission information to N.C.W.C. itself and to individual Catholic enterprises.

In numbers and in virility of program the lay organizations of the N.C.W.C. family are with precedent. Here the chief components in a vast program of adult education are the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women. The Men's and Women's Councils serve as channels between Catholic lay organizations and the various departments of the N.C.W.C., as well as carrying on specific well organized programs of their own. The Councils, widely affiliated with well-known Catholic national and regional groups, do not in any way control the activities of such organizations which remain autonomous, but they do offer an ideal means for such groups to join together in a coordinated program of identifying the religious and social teachings of the Church and in exerting a significant influence on the individual and social life of the nation according to Christian principles.

The National Council of Catholic Men, in addition to pamphlet series, and a series disseminating Catholic doctrine to newspapers and individuals (the Narbeth movement) produce a series of radio programs, the Catholic Hour (N.B.C.), the Christian in Action (A.B.C.), and Faith in Our Time (M.B.S.). It is responsible on TV for the Catholic part in a part of a larger series produced as the "Frontiers of Faith."

The Catholic Women of America are drawn together in a federated program under the auspices of the National Council of Catholic Women. This Council conducts a program of education and information by means of study clubs, institutes, conferences, conventions, and a national committee system.

The National Council of Catholic Women includes about 7,000 affiliated organizations in 83 dioceses with a membership of approximately seven million women. Nineteen national organizations are affiliated. The wide scope of committee organizations include such important units as Family and Parent Education, Home and School Associations, Youth, Catholic Charities, Social Action, Immigration, and International Relations.

The National Council of Catholic Nurses has as its object the instructing of its members in moral and religious duties of their work; the study and action according to Christian principles, of problems arising in their profession; and the promotion of volunteer services in the care of the sick and the poor.

Researches completed by the various departments of N.C.W.C. are frequently available as pamphlets, studies or monographs. Other publications deal with virtually every field of Catholic interest—encyclicals, education, labor, peace, citizenship, the family, immigration, Catholic radio addresses, study outlines, and many others.

The record, through the years, of the educational efforts of the N.C.W.C. is a great one. As an institution it has benefited every Catholic in the nation and the nation as a whole, its work touching the lives of so many and enriching with Christian leaven and fellowship the life of the nation.

Other Educational Agencies

The Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs was founded in 1946. Its purposes were to bring together a broadly representative group of Catholics who are members of the various learned professions, creative artists and writers, and leaders of Catholic opinion, in order to focus attention on Catholic intellectual and cultural life at home, and to promote Catholic intellectual and cultural cooperation in the world at large and by collaborating with similar groups in other countries to work for a truly Christian life and for a just and peaceful world order.

The Commission seeks to enlist and to utilize the abilities of Catholic scholars and leaders particularly among the laity. Its membership is now 220 members. Besides its national meeting the Commission has held numerous regional meetings throughout the country. Liaison has been established with L'Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales, Centre Catholique Intellectuels Francais, and Movement International des Intellectuels Catholiques.

Among the publications have been *Catholic Participation in the Intellectual Movements of Today* and *C.C.I.C.A. at the Twenty-Second World Congress of Pax Romana, Canada 1952*. A Directory is also available which sets down biographical sketches of the members, along with their scholarly classification.

In addition to the C.C.I.C.A. there are many learned societies which publish journals or studies at regular intervals. These include groups of theologians, philosophers, historians, economists, sociologists, and the like. Late in 1953 these groups of separate societies plan to form a council of Catholic learned societies.

The alumni groups of the various colleges have also proved to be instruments of education as well as sociability. The alumnae of Catholic Colleges for women have been formed into the "International Federation of Catholic Alumnae."

The Liturgical Movement is an important phase of Catholic education in the United States. It has stressed the interdependence of the three factors of doctrine, holiness of

A

Roman Catholic Layman Asks —

ARE WE REALLY TEACHING RELIGION?

A few years ago F. J. Sheed was asked to speak on this subject to an audience of teaching nuns. His talk aroused unexpectedly great interest and we are now publishing it with an added note on points about which the author has since received a stream of questions.

We think you may find it useful: the question of how best to make religion a living force in children's lives is not, after all, solely a problem for Roman Catholics! With the greater part of the author's suggestions no denomination will quarrel. It would be hard, for instance, to find a Christian teacher who would disagree with his idea of the "absolute minimum" of religion children should have on leaving school: "a tremendous devotion to Christ Our Lord, with an awareness of Him, a considerable knowledge of His life and Personality, and a desire to increase that knowledge."

Are We Really Teaching Religion? is paper bound and can be bought from any bookstore for 75c.

There is more about this book and others that might interest you in Sheed & Ward's OWN TRUMPET. This contains new and reprinted book reviews, extracts from books to come and our Fall list. It comes free and postpaid: just send a card to Educa MacGill,

SHEED & WARD

New York 3

life and Christian action in the work of re-establishing all things in Christ. In seeking above all to restore to the laity an active participation in the Mass and in the sacramental life of the Church it has always tried to set down the doctrinal foundations and implications involved and to emphasize the far-reaching results which such active participation should bring into the personal and social life of Catholics.

The Liturgical Movement has been said to have come of age with the publication of the Encyclical *Mediator Dei* in 1947. For the laity it has made most clear the nature and purpose of the liturgy as well as ways to promote the active participation of the faithful in divine worship.

A Liturgical Conference has sponsored Liturgical Weeks which were originally inaugurated by the Benedictine Liturgical Conference. Valuable periodicals have been launched that deal with the liturgy in general terms, in the home, with reference to music, etc., such as *Altar and Home*, *The Catholic Choirmaster*, *Cecilia*, *Liturgical Arts*, and *Orate Frates*.

Conclusion

These lines have been set down to give a general picture of the Catholic educational apparatus in America. The story is by no means a complete one, and the author offers an apology for his failure to touch upon many important areas. Nothing has been said in praise of the great work done by the Jesuit Educational Association, the Franciscan Educational Conference, the National Benedictine Educational Association, the National Catholic Music Educators Association. The Catholic Art Association, and the hundreds of institutes and conferences conducted by religious communities and lay groups in the United States have not been treated.

Insufficient space has been given to educational research carried on in our Catholic Universities. Practically no mention has been made of Catholic books and the Catholic Library Association. For these omissions the author begs the readers indulgence and hopes that at another time the place of these agencies and their fine contributions to Catholic education may receive adequate attention.

III

Jewish Education IN THE UNITED STATES AT THE MID-CENTURY¹

ISRAEL S. CHIPKIN

Vice-President, American Association for Jewish Education; Vice-President, for Research and Experimentation, Jewish Education Committee of New York City.

TO NOTE the mid-century mark in the development of American Jewish education is to view its progress and prospects with historic perspective. Historic perspective helps us to understand American Jewish education as an ongoing process in space and time which not only produces a bond of continuity within Jewish life and values, but also relates them to the American environment and to world events. It is in this perspective that we must examine the process of American Jewish education, observe the direction of its development and assay its current status.

Significant World Events During the First Half Century

Many stirring events during the past fifty years have produced profound effects on the course of American Jewish life and have therefore also influenced the developments in American Jewish education. These events are too numerous even to mention. The few events selected here will help to illustrate their social and historical impacts on all peoples and on American Jews in particular.

The first half of the twentieth century has an unusual record of catastrophic as well as life-generating events. On the debit side we find such events as the First and Second World Wars, the rise of Fascism and Communism and the imminence of a Third World War to decide whether Democracy or Totalitarianism shall prevail in this world. On the credit side may be listed such events as the development of the relativity and quantum theories, the splitting of the atom, the contraction of space and time through the radio, television and the airplane, the extension of the life-span through discoveries in the medical sciences, as in biotics and surgery, the ad-

vances in religion and philosophy through the discoveries in the psychological and social sciences, and through stress on humanism, realism and democracy, the establishment of a League of Nations and its successor the United Nations, the peaceful liberation of colonial empires such as India, Indonesia, Burma, and the restoration of the State of Israel.

Their Influence on Jewish Life

How have world events influenced developments in Jewish life? On the debit side we find destruction of Jewish settlements in Eastern Europe, first through the pogroms in Russia in 1904-5, and later during World War I. During World War II Hitler destroyed what was left of Jewish group life in Eastern and Central Europe. Before and since the war, Russian Communism has been gradually liquidating Jewish religious, cultural or communal existence among surviving Jews. Until World War II, the tendency towards assimilation absorbed many individual Jews not only under communism, but also in democratic countries in Europe and America.

On the credit side we find many undertakings on the part of world Jewry, and especially on the part of American Jewry, to save their brethren, to rehabilitate them and to restore their remnants to a homeland of their own in ancient Israel.

At the beginning of the century, mass emigrations of Jews from Eastern Europe followed upon the outbreaks of the Russian pogroms. The migrants came mostly to America where they were well received by their American brethren. Other more limited migrations to North and South America followed the Bolshevik revolution and the two world wars. Out of World War I came two

¹Reprinted by special permission from the American Association for Jewish Education.

hopeful and constructive measures for world Jewry: minority rights in European countries and the Balfour Declaration to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

The Second World War cast the spell of doom over all Jews, but also generated within them a deathless resolve to wrest life and freedom from the world. The horrible destruction of six million Jews by Nazism, the fight to death by Polish Jewry, the unwillingness of the nations of the world to open their doors to the persecuted homeless remnants of world Jewry, and the heroic determination of Palestine Jewry, with the help of American Jewry, to establish a homeland for themselves and their refugee brethren, finally won from the United Nations and the Arabs the restored State of Israel.

Effects on American Jewry

These events stirred American Jewry to many fraternal activities which found their expression in numerous local, national and overseas fund-raising or service agencies. These activities and agencies subsequently influenced the very character and structure of American Jewish life. Thus we note that American Jewry's protest against the Kishinev pogroms (1903-05) and their concern for the new immigrants who came to these shores in great number, led to the founding of the American Jewish Committee and the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS). The need to alleviate widespread suffering of Jews in Europe after World War I led to the establishment of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. The popular action to obtain from the Versailles Conference the protection of Jewish rights abroad brought about the establishment of the American Jewish Congress. The Zionist Organization of America and its several related parties and groupings became the American expression of political, religious, cultural and labor Zionism. Following the Balfour Declaration during World War I, these organizations helped the World Zionist Organization to form the Jewish Agency for Palestine, vis-a-vis the League of Nations, and to assume the responsibility for the rebuilding of the Jewish Homeland. After

World War I they initiated the United Palestine Appeal.

The extraordinarily augmented responsibilities which events during and since World War II placed upon American Jewry resulted in the merging of the Joint Distribution Committee, the United Palestine Appeal and the United Service for New Americans (an agency for settlement of Jewish refugees in America) into a new organization—the United Jewish Appeal. Through these united efforts an attempt was made to coordinate the fund-raising and the services of the several agencies concerned with overseas aid. To this Appeal were subsequently added the fund-raising efforts of civic-protective agencies of American Jewry. To fight for the political rights of Jews at the expected peace conference that was to follow World War II as well as at the founding conference of the United Nations, there was assembled the American Jewish Conference, representative of all Jews in America. Upon its subsequent dissolution there followed the Zionist Emergency Council, through which American Jewry widened its political activities on behalf of the reestablishment of a Jewish State.

In addition to these many activities on behalf of their Jewish brethren overseas, American Jews began to sense a greater responsibility for their own communal welfare. Their own numbers had grown from 1,058,000 in 1900 to 4,500,000 in 1950. To take care of the religious and social needs of Jewish youth in the armed services during and between the two world wars, there was created the National Jewish Welfare Board. Between these two wars the agency assumed the responsibility for developing a program of recreational and cultural activity for youth found in the YMHA's and Jewish Centers throughout the country. As a result of the spread of Nazism and Fascism before World War II, whose scourges also reached the American continent, existing agencies which were concerned with Jewish political and civic rights abroad, such as the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Labor Committee, the B'nai B'rith and a number of local Jewish communities developed civic-protective programs against

anti-Semitism. These several agencies subsequently coordinated their efforts to form the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Effects on Local Jewish Community Needs

The preoccupation with overseas aid, with Jewish youth in the armed services and with defense against anti-Semitism, did not prevent American Jewry from looking after their own growing local community needs. Quite the contrary. The greater the measure of responsibility they assumed for these overseas and defense purposes, the greater grew their measure of support of local philanthropic, social, religious and educational activity. The number of synagogues, schools, hospitals, homes for the aged, child care and family agencies multiplied.

All this activity on behalf of overseas and local needs developed within many an American Jew a keener awareness of his responsibility for the welfare of his fellow Jews. This awareness finally led to more efficiently organized programs of community structure, community responsibility and community leadership. Not only were Jews concerned with better and increased fund-raising, but with higher standards of services. While at first local charitable institutions and agencies joined to form local Federations of Charities, the increased needs for overseas aid during the past twenty-five years brought about the organization of Jewish Welfare Funds or combined Jewish Appeals which helped to coordinate and intensify community efforts, the better to discharge local measures of responsibility for all welfare needs, American as well as overseas. The need for a wider measure of responsibility and better organization involved an attempt to reach every Jew in the community, an invitation to him to contribute to community planning and services, an effort to spread reliable information concerning local, national and overseas needs and a greater measure of cooperation with other organized communities in discharging common responsibilities. These factors, in turn, contributed to an increased democratization of local Jewish community councils, and to the establishment of a national coordinating research and service

agency called the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, which is now promoting Jewish communal organization and higher standards for communal services.

Effects on Spiritual Expression of American Jewry

The intensification and improvement of their philanthropic endeavor does not seem to have interfered with American Jewry's responsiveness to the needs of their own spiritual welfare. Increased immigration from Eastern Europe to America brought with it a multiplication of synagogues and Jewish education institutions. This development has continued between the two world wars. Not only have they increased in number but also in variety. Moreover, institutions have benefited from American Jewry's mastery of the technique of organization, so that today there are several organized nationwide religious groupings, each with its respective institutions of higher learning and for the training of leaders. They are the Orthodox, the Conservative and the Reform. With each are affiliated synagogues and schools of their respective interpretation of Judaism or of God and Torah. In addition, there is also a secular-culturist grouping with its social and educational institutions which represents still another interpretation of Judaism. It is noteworthy that this structural organization and ideological differentiation within American Jewry progressed especially during the period between the two world wars when American Jews were so busy serving world Jewry, aiding in the establishment of the State of Israel and building their own local community life.

Despite the tendency toward differentiation in the religious and intellectual expression of American Jewish life, there is noticeable also a contrary tendency towards acceptance of a greater number of common elements in Judaism. Both of these tendencies may be the direct or indirect influences of the American way of life. On the one hand, American democracy encourages religious and cultural pluralism. On the other hand, American bigness and American techniques

influence the very structure of religious organizations and their administration, and even the design of their buildings. As a result, we find that not only do synagogues and school buildings belonging to the various Jewish groupings resemble each other in design and operation, but so do, in many cases, their respective types of worship services and school programs.

A rapprochement of religious views is taking place in other ways. Once the idea of working towards the restoration of a State of Israel in Palestine caused dissension and friction between the Jewish religious and cultural groupings. Today they are united behind it. Once ritualism and symbolism greatly emphasized the division among the Jews. Today many Orthodox Jews fail to observe prescribed ceremonies, while the Reform and the secularists have actually taken steps to return to certain traditional forms and practices. In yet another respect these groupings resemble each other. Within each of them there is a division into conservative and liberal interpretations of their respective Judaisms. A most significant manifestation of the striving toward a more common bond of religious expression is to be found in the rise of an American school of Jewish thought called Reconstructionism, which seeks consciously to reconstruct American Jewish life for the individual and for the community on the basis of Judaism as a religious civilization. This intensified interest in the spiritual and cultural expressions of American Jewish life has had its effects not only on the specifically religious and educational organizations but curiously also on the social agencies. Thus we observe that national agencies, devoted primarily to civic protection, recreational, Zionist or philanthropic purposes, have begun to add Jewish cultural activities to their programs.

To the interaction of world events and Jewish events during the first half of the twentieth century, American Jewry responded in accordance with the finest in Jewish tradition. As a community it has written an epoch-making chapter in Jewish history which can compare favorably with those of preceding generations. Of course, the historian of this

period in American Jewish history will, with justice, report many shortcomings or even backslidings. But, which generation or community in history had escaped them? Not only has American Jewry fulfilled, with devotion and consecration, the *mitzvoth* commanding the "redemption of the captive," and the redemption of the people and Land of Israel, but it has also sanctified the name of God and lent greater glory to the name of Jew. What world events tended to destroy, American Jewry sought to rebuild and, in the process, discovered its own dormant spiritual resources.

Effects on Jewish Educational Progress

This epoch-making record has not failed to make its impression on the growing Jewish youth of America and on the educational system which American Jewry built up in this country. The original literary and spiritual sources have continued to serve as the core and the content of Jewish education in America. Its structural form, however, reflects much of the American environment. Slow in development, and awaiting the end of economic and social pressures for adjustment to the environment, the American Jewish school system, a supplementary system to that of the public school, received its first real creative impulse when in 1910, in New York City, it became a community responsibility. The number of organized Jewish communities grew during the past twenty-five years. As they assumed greater measures of responsibility for a community program of Jewish education, the number and variety of Jewish schools grew. Today, nearly every well-organized Jewish community has a system of one-day-a-week, weekday afternoon and all-day schools, which include graded classes from the kindergarten through the college level, and are representative of the ideological groups in the community. While ideological autonomy is granted to each school within the community program, it accepts the supervision and the pedagogic services of the community's central agency for Jewish education with which it is affiliated, in keeping with the American democratic principle of diversity within unity.

How much of a system of American Jewish

education has been developed in the past fifty years? What are its constituent elements, how well do they function; what is the aim of American Jewish education; what is its contribution to Jewish life or to American life? These are questions with which the balance of this chapter will deal.

As previously stated, the answers to these questions are related to the progress of world events and influences upon developments in American Jewish community life. The process of Jewish education in America, its content and its present status are the consequences of these developments.

Interdependence of School and Society

At the very beginning of the twentieth century, Dr. John Dewey in America called attention to the interdependence of school and society. He showed how a democratic society influences the personality growth of the child and how scientific standards, free learning and activity and cooperative effort in a school help to assure a democratic society. In Jewish tradition, Jewish education is held as the supreme responsibility of the Jewish community without which it is bereft of character, purpose or continuity. Now that Jewish community life in America has grown more mature, it must assume a greater responsibility for the progress and effectiveness of the educational process it generates. On the other hand, now that the structure of Jewish educational system in America has been erected, it must assume a specialized purpose or function in developing Jewish personality and Jewish community life. What is this purpose or function? What can it contribute?

Jewish Education and its Function in America

Jewish education can contribute to the spiritual growth of the individual and of society. It can make this contribution through the social and religious practices of the individual Jew and through the social ideals developed and transmitted by the Jewish people during thousands of years. It is the distinctive historic experience of the Jewish people and its by-product, — an outlook on life — which distinguishes the content of Jewish education

from that of other peoples. The preservation and enrichment of this content which we call the Jewish cultural heritage, through the educational process, is an obligation of Jewish parents and of the Jewish community. The proper discharge of this obligation can prove a blessing to Jewish children, a source of spiritual strength to the Jewish community and a cultural contribution to American civilization. These benefits represent a three-fold function which Jewish education can serve in America.

Jewish education can prove a blessing to Jewish children and youth insofar as the joyous and creative resources of Judaism can be exploited to enrich the growing personality of the individual, to help him to know himself, his parents and his background, to establish his relationship to world Jewry and to the world around him and to give purpose and meaning to his personal life.

Jewish education can prove a source of spiritual strength to the Jewish community inasmuch as it can help to give character to its group life, develop standards of conduct and mutual responsibility for the individual and the group, establish institutions for social welfare and for cultural and religious purposes, preserve the cultural heritage of the Jews and stimulate the pursuit and growth of prophetic, rabbinic and democratic ideals.

Jewish education can prove a cultural contribution to American civilization in the measure that it contributes to religious and cultural pluralism, to the principles and practices of American democracy and to the doctrines of the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God.

Jewish education in America has still a further function to discharge, namely, to absorb as well as to contribute. Jewish education can help to infuse the content and structure of Jewish community life with the ideal and practices of American democracy, which permit diversity of opinion within community of action. Jewish education can also apply to its own process the high standards, the scientific knowledge and the experimental procedures which have made American education the foundation of American democracy.

Current Provisions for American Jewish Education

Whether the Jewish educational process in America can fulfill its functions depends largely on the measure and kind of facilities provided for this purpose by individual Jews and by Jewish communities throughout the country. What are the current provisions for American Jewish education? Is there a Jewish educational system in this country? What is its structure? How does it operate, and what does it achieve?

First and foremost, whatever of Jewish educational endeavor does exist, is based on voluntary interest. This means that whatever schools exist and whatever their operating costs, they are completely the result of voluntary action or contributions by individuals, by private organizations or by organized Jewish communities. The attendance in existing schools is also absolutely voluntary except as parents control the behavior of their children. Measured in terms of this Voluntarism, the record of Jewish educational achievement in this country, to date, is relatively high. Measured in terms of educational standards and of pupil enrollment, it is relatively low. What are the facts? Briefly reported, they are as follows:

Enrollment

There are today (1950) in this country about 635,000 plus Jewish children of elementary school age.² About 42% of this number are currently reported as attending some recognized Jewish school. This percentage is larger in smaller communities and smaller in larger communities. This figure does not mean that the remaining children never receive some kind of Jewish education. Actually, it is estimated that more than 80% of Jewish children *do attend* one or another type of Jewish school during the course of their elementary school years, except that they *do not all attend at the same time or stay long enough* to complete their elementary courses of Jewish study. Of the High School age group, only about 10,000 pupils or

3.8% are reported in attendance. Of the elementary school children who are enrolled, 50.2% are in one-day-a-week schools, (usually referred to as Sunday Schools), 41.8% are in afternoon weekday schools, and 8.0% are in private and congregational all-day schools (erroneously referred to by some as 'parochial schools').

Types of Schools

These three types of schools differ from each other in matters of schedule, point of view, program of studies, pupil achievement, teacher requirements, organization costs, auspices, origin and development. It is, however, the number of hours of instruction which helps best to classify them. The one-day-a-week school offers its pupils a rudimentary Jewish education. The weekday afternoon school offers them an extensive Jewish education, and the all-day school — an intensive Jewish education.

The Sunday School

As we have previously noted, 50.2% of all pupils (2,666,609) enrolled in Jewish elementary schools are to be found in the one-day-a-week schools. They are most frequently referred to as Sunday Schools because nearly all of them conduct their classes on Sunday mornings. They are also known as Religious Schools. There are a few whose classes meet on Saturdays only. Of the estimated total number of school units of all types, (2,745) 43.1% belong to the one-day-a-week group, and of the estimated total number of teachers in all types of schools (9,845) 61.3% belong to this group.

The time of instruction in most one-day-a-week schools is on the average two hours a week. There are some who offer more and some less. Part of this instruction time is used for assembly exercises. These schools usually meet between thirty and thirty-five Sundays a year and provide a total of sixty to seventy hours of instruction per year. Their course of study is from six to eight years.

The one-day-a-week school is usually identified with the Reform congregation and its auspices even though the Reform group issued recently a curriculum also for a two and three-day-a-week school. The fact is that

²Based on information supplied by the American Association for Jewish Education, through its Department of Research and Information, directed by Dr. Uriah Z. Engelman.

Conservative congregations, too, have Sunday school units. So do a large number of Orthodox congregations, especially outside New York City, and so do a number of Yiddish labor groups.

That the Sunday school unit should have been adopted in some form or another by the major Jewish ideological groups in this country is testimony to the influence of the American environment, and points to its pragmatic value. The one-day-a-week school has no historic counterpart in Jewish tradition or practice. Saturday may have been used by adults for their own Jewish studies or for reviewing with their children their daily Jewish studies of the week, but attendance at Jewish school was a *daily* requirement. The Sunday School in America is a Protestant contribution to religious education,³ and represents an adjustment to the American public school which is attended by children of all faiths and where sectarian religion may not be taught. Previous to the establishment of the public school, American children received their daily instruction in schools conducted by the respective religious groupings.

It was in 1838 that Rebecca Gratz founded the first Jewish Sunday School for the "free instruction in Jewish history and related subjects to Jewish children in Philadelphia." A similar school was opened that same year by another lady in Charleston, S. C.⁴ Both schools were communal and philanthropic in character. They were not founded as a pattern for Reform Judaism. They were motivated by a desire to give Jewish children some measure of Jewish education where they received none otherwise. That this type of school should have enjoyed to date such widespread acceptance among Jewish par-

ents in this country may be due to two causes: their desire not to burden their children with attendance at two daily schools, involving evening hours, and their apparent failure to provide more attractive and more effective Jewish schooling for their children. At the same time, we must record the fact that despite the availability of the Sunday School with its abbreviated schedule, there is still a very large percentage of Jewish children who receive little or no Jewish education.

The program of studies in the one-day-a-week school differs with the ideological auspices under which it is conducted. While the language of instruction in all of them is English, some of them also introduce the teaching of Hebrew or Yiddish. In the Orthodox and Conservative congregations, there is more stress on traditional observances. In Reform congregations the school curriculum has during the past twenty-five years been nationally planned and directed through their National Commission on Jewish Education. The emphasis in this curriculum has been on preparation for participation in synagogue worship and on identification with Jewish life. The school studies include prayers and ceremonies, festival celebrations, religious and ethical teachings, biblical stories and selections, some Jewish history, some current events, a little Hebrew, participation in charitable and civic activities, and preparation for confirmation.

The teachers in Sunday schools are most often those who teach or have taught in public schools. There is an increasing demand in many congregations for higher standards of the Jewish training of these teachers and for their official certification on the basis of prescribed qualifications.

The Weekday Afternoon School

³The released time program has been established in nearly all the states and in thousands of communities all over the country. Its adherents report millions of enrolled pupils. Jewish organizations and religious leaders have, by and large, failed to accept this plan for their own children. While they have cooperated in inter-faith committees for goodwill reasons, they have recommended a substitute plan called "dismissed time."

⁴Leo L. Honor — "Jewish Education in the U. S." — *The Jewish People — Past and Present* — Vol. II — Central Yiddish Culture Organization — 1948.

Of the pupils enrolled in Jewish elementary schools, 49.8% are to be found in weekday schools meeting after or during public school hours; (41.8% in the afternoon schools and 8.0% in the all-day schools). Of the estimated total number of school units, 52.3% are week-day afternoon schools in which are to be found close to 29% of the estimated total number of teachers employed.

Attendance at the weekday afternoon school varies with the school. There are some schools where pupils attend five days a week (32.9%), some where they attend four days (22.4%), some—three days (34.7%), and some—two days (10.1%). The majority of these weekday schools offer five or four days, 7½ or 6 hours per week, and 38 weeks per year of instruction. A few of them offer more and many of them less. In number of hours of instruction most pupils receive about 285 hours per year. There are, however, some who receive as many as 400 hours per year. These figures compare with 60 to 70 hours per year in the Sunday school.

The more traditional schools usually require more hours of attendance and offer a six-year course of study. Some of the weekday afternoon schools prescribe a five or a three-year course. In the latter case, the elementary course may be supplemented by a Junior or Senior high school course, depending upon the pupil's entrance age. The vast majority of the pupils in these schools remain only two or three years. Most of them enter at the age of nine or ten or just before thirteen for Bar Mitzvah (confirmation) purposes.

Weekday afternoon schools are conducted under congregational or communal auspices. It is the Orthodox schools that require more frequent attendance and longer hours of instruction.

Five, four and three days a week schools are common to all groupings, except perhaps the Yiddishist Labor and the Reform. Among the latter there is a recent tendency to add one weekday session (about two hours) to the Sunday school session. The three day a week school is most frequently found among the Conservative and Yiddish Labor groupings. Congregations usually refer to their schools as religious schools, while those under communal auspices are generally called Talmud Torahs. In their religious attitudes, the latter are most often Orthodox and sometimes Conservative.

Historically, the Talmud Torah (the Study of Torah) is an institution which had its origin in Jewish tradition and especially in Talmudic times. The teaching of Torah to the young was a religious duty of parents from the

days of the Bible. The maintenance of Talmud Torah classes, especially for the children of the poor, was a religious obligation faithfully adhered to by Jewish communities in Palestine and in the Diaspora. The Talmud Torah was brought to this country by immigrants from Eastern Europe, together with a sister institution called the "Heder" (room). The latter was a private school attended by children whose parents could afford to pay tuition fees. The former was a school for the children of the poor, maintained by the community. The Heder was so called because it was a room set aside in the private home of a "melamed" (teacher) for instruction of his pupils. Its replica in this country did not thrive. Here, the "rebbe" (teacher), usually an elderly gentleman, unadjusted to his American environment and unprepared for any other vocation, pursued his occupation out of economic necessity. The pupils learned little and their learning experience, compared with that in the public schools, made Judaism unattractive to them.

Even as the Heder failed in this country, the Talmud Torah succeeded. In fact, it assumed a special American form and character. Jewish parents were denied the privilege of a general education by the governments in Eastern Europe. When they reached American shores, they embraced the democratic public school for their children and remained its loyal devotees. They were concerned, of course, also with the Jewish education of their children. They sought to provide this education after public school hours. The Talmud Torah soon became the afternoon Jewish community school for rich and poor alike after the pattern of the public school, except that parents who could afford it, paid a monthly tuition fee, while scholarships were supplied by the local members and directors of the neighborhood Talmud Torah society.

The Talmud Torah was usually housed in a building of its own. Its pupils and its course of study were graded even as in the public schools. Because it was a community-supported school, it attracted learned and idealistic teachers who had fled European persecution or hardships. These schools laid the foundations for subsequent secondary and

teacher training schools. Out of these Talmud Torahs eventually came many of the personnel who now serve as Hebrew teachers or as rabbis in American communities. In more recent years, because of the shifting of population, local Jewish community Welfare Funds have taken over the support of these Talmud Torahs.

The All-Day School

Successful as was the Talmud Torah, its heyday seems to have passed together with the influx of Jewish immigrants to this country. As Jews became economically and socially adjusted, they moved into less congested neighborhoods, established local congregations and erected beautiful synagogues and temples, which also provided local Jewish school facilities. Thus the neighborhood Talmud Torah was transformed into the congregational weekday school and Sunday school. Instead of requiring their pupils to attend a minimum of five days or ten hours a week, these congregational schools began to accommodate parents and pupils with a two or three-day-a-week schedule, and in some cases, with as little as four hours of instruction per week. Even the communal Talmud Torahs in the older and poorer neighborhoods have begun to feel the effects of this change of attitude. Less hours of instruction have lowered the standard of pupil achievement, weakened the position of the Jewish teacher, and practically emaciated the program of the weekday afternoon school.

On the other hand, there are many parents who want an intensive Jewish training for their children. They realize that the great Jewish literary and religious heritage accumulated over the ages cannot be transmitted during the shortened hours of the new congregational weekday school or Talmud Torah, nor do they overlook the burdensome schedule of attending two schools a day. They have therefore developed for themselves the private all-day school. This all-day school meets during public school hours, and sometimes adds to them an hour or more per day. Its course of study includes the regular public school program as well as an intensive program of Jewish subject matter. While most all-day schools are Yeshivoth, under Ortho-

dox auspices, there are also others under Conservative, Hebraist or Yiddish-Labor auspices. The relative growth of these all-day schools is extraordinary. While the first of the existing Yeshivoth was organized in New York City in 1886 and another in 1903, about eighty percent of them have been established since 1945 and for this reason do not have a full eight-year course of study.

As recorded previously, of all the pupils enrolled in the several types of existing Jewish schools, 8.0% are to be found in these all-day schools. Of the total estimated number of school units, 4.6% are all-day schools and of the total estimated number of teachers in all types of schools, 9.7% are in the all-day schools.

Despite its recent and relatively rapid growth, the all-day school accommodates for the present only about 3.4% of the total number of Jewish children of elementary school age in this country.

The Jewish all-day school is sometimes referred to as the Jewish parochial school because it offers religious as well as secular subjects and serves in place of the public school. Actually it differs from a "parochial" school because it is not a parish or church school, since there is no central or overall "church" in Judaism. In fact, it is a private school conducted and supported by a local membership society, which elects its own school board. Parents contribute either dues or fees to the society, which also solicits scholarships for poor pupils from individual donors or from central community funds. Many Jewish communities are beginning to recognize the value of these schools as special preparatory institutions to schools of higher learning, where qualified students can train for religious or communal service and for Jewish scholarship.

The all-day school meets five days a week, six or more hours per day. Most of them offer about 38 weeks and nearly 1200 hours of instruction per year. Individually they vary among themselves in daily schedule, in language of instruction, in emphasis on the subjects of study. The Orthodox group calls this school the "Yeshivah Ketanah" or "Junior Academy," to distinguish it from the traditional "Yeshivoth" or Talmudical academies

for adolescents and adults which were for centuries the traditional seats of higher learning and which produced the famed rabbis and scholars in Jewish history. The term "Yeshivah" in connection with these elementary schools was borrowed to emphasize the fact that Talmud was a subject of intensive study in these schools. The "Yeshivah Ketanah" stresses strict observance of ritual law and intensive study of original biblical and Talmudic sources. Its pupils begin their day with Hebrew prayers and continue with religious studies during the first half of the school day. Their secular or English subjects, prescribed by the State Department of Education, are studied in the afternoon. All general subjects are taught in English by State certified teachers, while the Hebrew or religious subjects are taught by another set of teachers qualified to teach in Hebrew or in Yiddish. The latter language is used especially in the teaching of the original Talmud text by teachers who have themselves come from Yiddish-speaking Yeshivot in Europe. Hebrew teaching as a language is secondary in this type of Orthodox school.

There is, however, a group of "Yeshivot Ketanot" where the study of the Hebrew language and literature as such is considered important, and spoken Hebrew is used in the teaching of biblical and Talmudic texts.

There are some "Yeshivot" and other all-day schools which follow a different schedule or pattern of instruction. They seek to integrate Hebrew and general subject matter. English or Hebrew subjects are offered in alternate hours during the entire school day. In some of these schools, teachers are qualified to teach both Hebrew and English subject matter.

In all-day schools sponsored by Conservative groups, there is greater emphasis on the Hebrew language and literature than on Talmudic study, although that subject, too, is included. There is, of course, a less Orthodox approach to religious observance. In the case of the Yiddish and laborite schools, there is greater stress on the Yiddish language and literature and a more radical or secular approach to religious observance.

The Foundation School

Not every Jewish all-day school has been established as a complete substitute for the public school. There are some who retain their pupils through the primary grades only and then transfer them to the higher grades in the public school. The pioneer school in this group is known as Beth Hyeled, the House of the Child. It was founded in 1939 by Ivriah, the Women's Division of the Jewish Education Association, in New York City, as an experimental school in early childhood education, offering a bi-cultural program with emphasis on the personality development of the child, and with a view to laying an emotional and intellectual foundation for the child's subsequent attendance at the public school and at a Jewish weekday afternoon school. Children are admitted to this school at the age of three and remain there until the age of eight or nine. Thus they pass through the preschool, kindergarten and primary grades and then go on to Grade Three or Four in the public school. They are also prepared for more rapid progress in their adjustment to and in their pursuit of Jewish studies in the supplementary weekday school. To date, the Beth Hyeled has developed a bi-cultural experience program for its pupils that serves as an example to others. It has become a practice and observation center for teachers-in-training from local training schools and universities. Its research studies indicate relative success in the achievement of its purposes.

Secondary Schools

Each type of elementary school sends its graduates to its respective High School, or high school department. In some communities, where the number of graduates from one elementary school is too small to form a separate high school class, the graduates from Orthodox and Conservative elementary weekday schools may go to the same central communal Jewish High School. In such cases the ideological differences between these two groups do not seem to be too serious to keep them apart. The regrettable fact about the secondary schools is that their enrollment currently is only about 5% of that in the

elementary schools. The comforting fact about them is that this enrollment is growing.⁵ Their schedules correspond respectively to those of the elementary schools with which they are associated.

The course of study in these high schools is about four years. The subjects of study in the weekday afternoon schools include the original classics, the Bible, Prophets, Commentaries, Talmudic text, medieval and modern Hebrew literature, as well as history, Palestine, current events, Jewish religious and philosophic texts. The language of instruction is Hebrew. There are, of course, some high schools where the language of instruction in most subjects is English but where the Hebrew language and literature receive much attention.

The Sunday schools, too, have their high school classes, which offer two to four year courses. Their language of instruction is English. Their courses in Jewish history, religion, literature and Hebrew are more comprehensive than in their elementary classes.

The most intensive courses are given in the High School Departments of the all-day schools. There the pupils study intensively, especially the biblical, Talmudic and medieval classics. Many of them continue their studies in rabbinical departments of the same schools or at outside rabbinical schools.

Extra-Curricular Activities

Extra-curricular activities are to be found in all the types of schools mentioned. They involve celebration of the Sabbath or of festivals, Jewish and American, and participation in Jewish communal or charitable activities, student organizations, clubs, assemblies, choirs, dramatics, dancing and similar activities. The number of and time allotment for these activities depend upon the modernity of the school.

Summer Camps

It is interesting to note that a number of all-day schools have opened summer camps where their pupils continue their Jewish

studies for at least a part of the day. Other camps for Jewish children, more communal or general in character, have grown in number. While conducted in a Jewish religious and cultural spirit, they offer all the usual activities of camp life. In some of them, special classes for the study of Hebrew are provided. The spoken language in these camps is, of course, English. There are a few camps, opened in recent years, where the spoken language is Hebrew. Such camps are sponsored by Hebrew-speaking or religious organizations or are attached to Bureaus of Jewish Education and teacher-training schools. In these Hebrew camps, student-teachers and campers continue their Jewish studies part of the day and engage in the usual camp activities the rest of the day. There are also a number of Yiddish-speaking camps which have been in existence for many years.

Content of Studies—Differences and Common Elements

A. Differences

In discussing the several types of schools, we have noted that they differ among themselves in schedule, curriculum, program of studies, auspices, ideology or religious point of view. At the same time, many of the subjects they teach are common to all. Before recording these common elements, let us examine further the differences as they may effect the contents of study.

Four different groups were mentioned above: the Orthodox, the Conservative, the Reform and the Yiddish Laborites. Their origins are historically rooted in European Jewish experience. In this country, even their designations reflect the American Jewish environment.

The Orthodox group emphasizes the traditional attitudes and practices derived from rabbinic interpretation of Talmudic law, as codified in the Shulhan Arukh by Joseph Karo (1488-1575), which until recent years served as the basic religious law for the individual and for the Jewish community. It is in this country that the designation "Orthodox" was adopted. To this group belong the Yeshivoth, the Yeshivah University (Organ-

⁵ While not a part of the Jewish educational system, there are currently about 7,000 pupils studying Hebrew in New York City public Junior and Senior High Schools.

ized 1915—Founded as Yeshivah Rabbi Isaac Elchanan in 1897), the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (founded 1898), their rabbis and their several organizations, the Agudath Harabbanim (1902), the Rabbinical Council (1942), the Hassidic elements, the Mizrachi, the Agudath Israel, the Young Israel and all their respective affiliates.

The Conservative group still adheres to much of the traditional codified laws, but it is ready to accept a more liberal interpretation of customs, ceremonies and scriptures, and a more modern or evolutionary view of revelation. This group is represented by the United Synagogue of America, founded 1913, its congregations and their affiliates, by the Rabbinical Assembly of America, founded 1919, and by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, founded by Dr. Sabato Morais in 1886 and reorganized in 1902 by Dr. Solomon Schechter. They are called "Conservative," to distinguish them from the Orthodox on the one side and the Reform on the other.

The Reform, or Liberal group, is so called because of the changes in practices and beliefs it adopted in order to reform traditional Judaism. This group developed in this country under the influence of a number of rabbinical leaders, who came here about the middle of the nineteenth century from Germany and Central Europe, where as a result of the Emancipation, attempts were made to westernize Judaism. The outstanding leader among these rabbis was Isaac Mayer Wise, who founded the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1873 and the Hebrew Union College in 1875. The so-called Pittsburgh Platform of 1885, accepted by this group, announced a complete break with traditional laws, customs and ceremonies, a scientific approach to revelation and Scriptures and the negation of aspirations for a return of exiles to the land of Israel. This platform was substituted by the Columbus Platform, officially adopted in 1937 by the Central Conference of American Rabbis (founded 1889), which restored a more favorable attitude towards festival ceremonies, the Hebrew language and the Land of Israel.

To this group belong all the Reform or Liberal congregations, their rabbis and affiliates.

The Yiddish Laborites had their origins in Eastern Europe, where they participated actively in the political, economic, social and religious emancipation of the masses. Their leaders and followers who came to this country sought to preserve the language of the masses and their folkways, to modernize Jewish cultural values, to express their social ideals — through adherence to Socialism. Today their common attitudes towards traditional customs and religious values have undergone some changes, as have their interpretations of some aspects of socialist doctrine.

While this group is referred to as Yiddish and Laborite, it is really made up of several groups. For many years they divided into followers of the Zionist movement and those who belonged to the Bundist movement, with its emphasis on local minority rights of the Yiddish masses.

All these major and minor differences among the groups and within them are reflected in the teachings of the schools respectively affiliated with them.

B. Common Elements

Despite the many and significant differences among the several groups and their respective schools, there is a common core of content for all of them. After all, they are all part of the Jewish people, have a common past, live together, and face a common destiny. In 1944, the Supervisors of the several types of Jewish schools met under the auspices of the Jewish Education Committee of New York City and found that there was a set of common elements of *subject matter which they could all teach*.⁸

These are: (1) Torah, which represents the accumulated literary and spiritual heritage of the Jewish people through the centuries. Its development began with the Pentateuch and continued through many languages, especially Hebrew, to give expression to the way of life and to the growing social ideals of the Jewish people. It is today as ever the spiritual wellspring for the creative, cul-

⁸Reported by Dr. A. M. Dushkin, in *Jewish Education*, November, 1945, Vol. XVII, No. 1.

tural religious development of the Jewish people. (2) *Personal Jewish Living*, implies the application of Torah as a way of life to personal behavior. It requires obedience to the moral law (obligations to God and to man), as well as observance of Jewish customs and laws. (3) *Hebrew* is the historical, classical, as well as modern language of the Jewish people. It has served as the repository of their great literary treasures and as the vehicle for their rich cultural expression. It is still needed today for the recital of prayer in the synagogue, for the study of the classics, and for reading the modern book or newspaper from Israel. (4) *The Jewish People* implies self-identification of the individual Jew with his people and his acceptance of mutual responsibility between himself and other Jews. Knowledge of the past and present of the Jewish people helps him toward more intelligent exercise of personal and group responsibilities towards preservation of his spiritual heritage and towards self-preservation. (5) *The Land of Israel*, like Hebrew, has been identified with the Jewish people, its past and present. It filled Jewish tradition and prayer. The entire literature is replete with its memories as well as with the longing expressed for its restoration. Today it is once more the homeland of the homeless Jew fleeing persecution and the responsibility of every Jew who feels kinship for his brethren everywhere. (6) *The American Jewish environment* is a fact with which every American Jew and American Jewish school must reckon. It implies a knowledge of the history and development of the Jewish community in America, participating in its institutional and communal activities, contributing to the cultural and spiritual welfare of the American commonwealth, and preserving the equality of the Jew as an American against anti-Semitic or other unAmerican influences. (7) *Faith* in a loving God and "in the divine purpose making for the improvement of world and man, involving the human obligation to strive toward a better, more informed democratic world order."

The order in which these common elements have been listed here bears no particular significance. These elements are inter-

related and may appear in any of the subjects studied. The treatment and interpretation, and the time allotment to each of them will vary with each school. Two assumptions underlie the teaching of these common elements in all the schools. They are: the desire to help preserve the Jewish people and its spiritual assets regardless of ideological changes promulgated by the group, and the readiness to make adjustment to environment regardless of the method of interpretation by the group. Thus we find that despite diversity of approach to Jewish and American values, all these schools are organically related to one another.

Methods

The method of teaching varies from the formal to the progressive within each type of school. Each school controls its own methods, text books, curriculum, teachers. Stress on memorization and use of original texts are greatest where more normal methods are used. In the less formal school, the curriculum includes the use of arts and crafts, dramatics, dancing, music, current events, trips, audio-visual aids, etc. Practically all schools have some curricular activities, as indicated previously.

The Development of an American Jewish School System

The variety of elementary and secondary schools described here points up the fact that the Jews in America have, during the past fifty years, developed a differentiated series of schools. Do these schools constitute a system organically related? The answer to this question depends upon the degree of relationship between one school and another and upon the measure of responsibility for them shared by the Jewish community at large. The first steps towards developing community responsibility for and mutual relationships between existing schools were those taken by Dr. Samson Benderly in New York City when he established in 1910 the local Bureau of Jewish Education under the auspices of the Kehillah. This was the first local central community agency for Jewish education in the U.S.A. Today (1950) there are about forty such agencies supported by local Jewish

welfare funds. These central agencies not only encourage ideological autonomy, but also, through supervision, help to advance educational standards within each type of school and to relate them one to another in a comprehensive and organic community program of Jewish education. As a result of this community guidance and support, we now have the structural outline of an American system of Jewish schools.

There are today in a number of Jewish communities a graded series of Jewish schools, ideologically related or communally coordinated, which include not only preschool and kindergarten classes, Foundation Schools for very young children, elementary schools, secondary schools and educational camps, but also Colleges of Jewish Studies, adult institutes for general Jewish study, and special training schools for teachers.

Youth and Adult Education

The formal institutes of Jewish studies for youth and adults⁷ and the Colleges of Jewish Studies have been developed in the past twenty-five years and have been growing in number. Of the latter, there are at present about a dozen in this country. They require three or four years of study towards graduation. They serve as continuation schools for graduates from Hebrew high schools and prepare students for advanced Jewish studies, and for training in the Jewish professions. These colleges are conducted by local Bureaus of Jewish Education or are attached to higher institutions of Jewish learning.

The Adult Institutes of Jewish Studies may be departments of the above colleges or they may be conducted as separate schools by local Bureaus of Jewish Education in cooperation with Centers or/and synagogues. Courses offered include Jewish history, Biblical studies, Hebrew or Yiddish, Current Events, Religion, Philosophy, the State of Israel and similar subjects. There are no formal requirements for admission but there are special requirements for those who seek certification and graduation.

⁷ The first one of its kind, the Israel Friedlander Classes, was organized in 1920-21 at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City.

Informal Jewish Education

Important as are these developments in formal education for Jewish youth and adults, equally important are the informal and activity programs of, by and for them. There are a number of national Jewish youth organizations whose affiliated groups may meet in synagogues, in schools or in Jewish centers. These youth organizations are in most cases the youth divisions of adult parent bodies, or agencies, Religious, Zionist, Hebraist Yiddish or Philanthropic in character. They usually express the ideological purposes and programs of their parent bodies, as well as their own youth interest through social, intellectual, communal and charitable activities. While in the main they are co-educational, there are some whose membership is confined to young men or to young women only.

The largest central agency for Jewish youth is the National Jewish Welfare Board, which has recently made Jewish activities a most essential part of Jewish Center programs. This agency reports that in 1947 there were 314 Centers, with a participating membership of 458,000. Of these, 37% were adolescents or young adults, 37% were adults and 26% were children.⁸ The activities in these Centers are conducted by trained group workers and are associated with Jewish events, festivals and community experiences. The J.W.B. itself sponsors and stimulates such projects as Jewish Book Month, Jewish Music Month, Jewish History Week, etc.

In addition to these formal and informal agencies, Jewish educational endeavor among youth and adults has been aided greatly by the large number of books of classic and modern Jewish interest published by the Jewish Publication Society in Philadelphia (founded 1885). This Society has also published books for children.

Women and Jewish Education

The interest of Jewish women in Jewish education, as students as well as communal workers is growing.

⁸ *Year Book, Jewish Social Work, 1947* (Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds), p. 49. In 1950 there were 342 Centers.

On the elementary school level, we find that girls constitute more than half the number of pupils in the one-day-a-week schools, less than one third in the weekday schools and more than one fourth the total register in the all-day schools. The lower percentage of girls in the more intensive schools is probably due to the erroneous and antiquated notion entertained by many parents that Jewish education is an obligation for boys, but not for girls. It used to be expected that the latter could acquire Jewish knowledge they needed at home, especially if they be Orthodox. Most Orthodox Yeshivot are established for boys only. Fortunately, the attitude towards girls' education is changing. The more modern Yeshivot are co-ed and there are even some Yeshivot for girls only.

On the secondary, college and teacher-training levels, we find not only a rise in the number of women students but, in many cases, a much higher percentage than of men. This fact is especially true of attendance at adult schools for Jewish study. Three facts may account for this change. A large number of girls in the elementary schools continue their Jewish studies; Jewish knowledge helps them to find teaching or office positions in Jewish institutions; Jewish knowledge helps them in Jewish home-making. Many an American Jewish home has become empty of Jewish religious practices or cultural values, which schools for adults are helping to restore.

An interesting phenomenon in American Jewish education is the number of married women and mothers who attend classes for Jewish studies conducted by synagogues and centers, by Jewish women's organizations and by adult schools. In New York City, a special Women's Institute for Jewish Students at the Jewish Theological Seminary serves several women's organizations. In other cities, some adult schools provide special lecture courses for each of the women's organizations. In many places, parent-teachers organizations supply lectures and classes for parents of children attending elementary schools.

In the area of Jewish communal activity on behalf of Jewish education, Jewish women's

organizations are playing an increasingly important role. Through parent-teachers organizations, mothers are helping to stimulate the interest of children and parents in Jewish studies and practices, to provide prizes, school furnishings and even scholarships for poor children. Most schools have their women's auxiliaries, and practically every synagogue has its sisterhood. In some cities there is a special women's division associated with the local Bureau of Jewish Education, like Israela in Los Angeles and Ivriah in New York City. It is the latter, organized in 1926, that founded the Beth Hayeled and contributed a new type of American Jewish school, namely, the Foundation School. In New York City there is also a city-wide United Parent-Teachers Organization. On the national level we have women's divisions associated with each of the respective ideological or religious groupings. Their membership consists of local sisterhoods and chapters, and they participate in all the educational projects of their respective parent bodies. Many of these women's organizations seek to interest their members not only in their respective synagogues and schools but also in the restoration of Jewish religious and cultural activities in their homes.

Teachers

Not only the point of view of a school but its very success depends upon the teacher and his qualifications. In the case of the Jewish school, whatever its type, these qualifications must be of high standard, if it is to succeed. It is the teacher, his personality, his behavior and his knowledge that become the source of Jewish inspiration for the child. It is the teacher who guides the Jewish child into Judaism and trains him for Jewish living. To succeed in the American Jewish school, the teacher must have training equivalent to that of a college graduate, in his general and Jewish knowledge and in pedagogics. His Jewish training should have included the study of the Hebrew and Yiddish languages, the classics and modern literature of both languages, the original sources of Judaism, the history, religion, philosophy and contemporary life of the Jewish people, including the American, European and Israeli scenes.

In pedagogy, he must know modern American theory and practice and be able to apply the same to the children and subjects of the Jewish school. But it is more than knowledge that he must possess. He must love children and Judaism, feel a sense of dedication to both, and enhance their spiritual potentialities.

The task of the teacher in the Jewish school is relatively more difficult and more responsible than the corresponding one in the public school. The former teaches more hours per year and the subject matter he offers his pupils is frequently foreign and burdensome to them. In the case of the afternoon school, pupils come to him after a full school day, tired and distracted, yet voluntarily, except for parental influence and the teacher's ability to attract them.

Despite the many qualifications and responsibilities demanded of the teacher in the Jewish school, his economic and social status is relatively lower than that of his colleague in the public schools and than that of other highly qualified Jewish communal or religious functionaries. Measures to improve his status have been taken by organized Jewish teachers organizations, as well as by central communal agencies for Jewish education, locally and nationally. These measures include provisions for regular salary schedules, tenure of office, health insurance and pensions, Boards of Review and Appeals. In addition, these measures include provisions for the professional growth of the teacher, such as teacher certification, in-service courses, supervision and opportunities for advancement to positions of greater responsibility and higher learning. These measures have been taken, not only to help and to hold the present limited personnel in this field of Jewish educational endeavor, but also to attract new personnel from the very best of our youth who may be able to find in this highly learned and spiritual vocation a sense of self-respect and self-fulfillment and an opportunity for consecrated service to children, to community, to country, to culture generally.

To prepare and to train teachers with these qualifications of personality and learning are the purposes and province of the Jewish

Teacher Training Schools, of which there are about a dozen in this country. Of these, seven have been accredited by the National Board of License, sponsored jointly by the National Council for Jewish Education and the American Association for Jewish Education. The others are still in various stages of development, not having the minimum requirements of this National Board. Following a recent survey of these schools, made under the auspices of this national body by Louis Hurwich, Dean Emeritus of Boston Jewish Teachers College, plans for a representative association of these training schools are under consideration.

There are six training schools in New York City. There are two in Chicago, and one each in Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Los Angeles, sponsored by local Bureaus of Jewish Education. There are beginnings of such schools also in Cleveland, Detroit, and Pittsburgh, and there are teacher-training courses offered by Bureaus in cities without training schools. They train teachers for weekday and Sunday schools and in some cases for all-day schools. Some of these schools are associated with rabbinical seminaries and represent their respective points of view. In New York City there are the Teachers Institute (founded 1909), of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (the Conservative), the Beth Midrash Lemorim (for men) founded 1917 and the Beth Midrash Lemorot (for women) founded 1928, of the Yeshivah University (Orthodox); the Yiddish Lehrer Seminar (founded 1918) of the Yiddish Laborite group, and the School of Education and Sacred Music (founded 1947), of the Reform group. The latter belongs to the two merged institutions, the Jewish Institute of Religion (New York City) and Hebrew Union College (Cincinnati). Another outstanding teacher-training school in New York City is the Herzliah Academy. It is not attached to any particular group. It is, however, Conservative, nationalistic and strongly Hebraistic in its emphasis. The first communal Jewish teacher training school was Gratz College in Philadelphia, organized in 1897 under communal auspices.

The accredited training schools require a minimum of four or five years of attendance. They vary in their requirements for admission and graduation, in hours of attendance, in ground covered and relative time given to subjects studied. A few of these schools have arrangements for exchange credits with local universities where their students pursue non-Jewish pedagogic studies. A few of these teacher training schools have the right to grant bachelor degrees in Jewish Education and some are permitted to grant higher degrees. Only recently have some of them begun to recognize the need for specialized departments in the field of Jewish education and to prepare candidates for such branches as pre-school teaching or supervision.

In 1945, Dropsie College in Philadelphia (founded 1907), a non-partisan graduate institution for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, devoted to Jewish scholarship, opened a Jewish Education Department for the purpose of training scholars, research workers, supervisors, text book writers, high school and college teachers, executives and other supervisory personnel in the field of Jewish education. Through cooperation with the American Association for Jewish Education, this college is now offering fellowships to encourage advanced studies in the science of Jewish education.

Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning

At the apex of the system of Jewish schools of America are the institutions of higher Jewish learning, which are concerned primarily with the preparation of scholars in the field of Jewish knowledge, or with the training of rabbis. About eight of them are known nationally. Most of them are Rabbinical Seminaries or Talmudical Schools. In the more modern of them one or more courses in Jewish education are offered, so as to acquaint rabbis-in-training with practical school problems they may have to face in the ministry. As we have noted previously, some of these seminaries and other institutions also have separate departments or schools for the training of teachers. Some of them have, in addition, departments for popular Jewish education, renowned libraries and museums

and outstanding publications. For example, the Jewish Theological Seminary has, besides its Teachers' Institute, also a College of Jewish Studies, a School of Jewish studies, the Eternal Light Radio program, a Department for interfaith Studies, a famous Jewish Library, a separate Jewish Museum Building and a University of Judaism in Los Angeles. The Yeshivah University has also a Department for Advanced Studies in Jewish Education and for Communal Service, a High School department, and its Department of Secular Studies. The Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion (merged 1948) has its centers in Cincinnati and New York. Its School of Education and Sacred Music in New York trains teachers for the Reform schools as well as cantors for all denominations. In Chicago there is the Orthodox Hebrew Theological College (1921) which has a Teacher Training Department (1940), and also the College of Jewish Studies with its Teacher Training and Graduate Departments. In New York City there are also the Yeshivah Torah V'daat (1918), the Yeshevath Yavne and Hassidic schools. The nonrabbinic schools include Dropsie College in Philadelphia, which has recently added a department for the study of Israel and the Near East and the Yiddish Scientific Institute in New York City (YIVO), brought to this country from Vilna, Poland, during the early days of the Hitler regime. This institution specializes in Jewish historical and sociological research, encourages workers in this field through a program of graduate fellowships and stimulates interest in Yiddish culture through a program of conferences, literary contests and prizes.

In addition to these several institutions, there was until recently, a Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service, which offered in the past, in-service and advanced training to a selected group of candidates in all branches of Jewish communal service. These workers usually received most of their training in general schools for social service or group work. Their Jewish training or experience they had to acquire while in service. This Training Bureau was successor to two previous attempts to conduct a special grad-

uate school for Jewish social service. These attempts were abandoned because of lack of community interest or popular support. Mention might also be made here of Brandeis University opened in 1948 in Waltham, Mass. It is a general American university conducted under Jewish auspices and includes departments for the study of the Hebrew language and literature and Jewish history.

Buildings and Finances

There is little available information concerning the number of existing Jewish school buildings in this country, their costs, facilities or equipment. About 2700 individual school units have been reported. Even if two school units are accommodated in one building, there would appear to be about 1,400 separate school buildings. The likelihood is that there are more. Their total costs would run into tens of millions of dollars. Too many of them are still, however, housed in vestry rooms of synagogues or in makeshift buildings. There is nevertheless a growing number of modern school buildings with excellent equipment under congregational as well as communal auspices.

The total costs of operating the existing Jewish school system in the U.S.A are also unknown. These costs are currently estimated at \$25,000,000, about 60% of which cover instructional costs. The money to cover these costs is received from parents, individual donors, congregational or communal sources. The latter includes Jewish Welfare Funds. The rates of costs and of income vary with each school. In the Sunday school, the cost is about \$25 to \$50 per year. In the weekday afternoon school, it is about \$125 to \$150. In the all-day school, it is about \$400 to \$650. The tuition fees charged rarely cover the costs. In addition there are so many full or partial scholarships, that most schools carry heavy annual deficits. In the case of congregational schools and membership fees include tuition fees as well. Despite the relatively large sums spent for Jewish schooling, the standards in too many of the schools remain low and a great many Jewish children remain outside of them.

Central Agencies for Jewish Education

The existence and cohesiveness of a system of Jewish schools in America depend upon the inter-relationship of their individual and separate units, the delineation of their respective tasks, the measure of their common purpose, their coordination and centralized direction. The achievements in these respects to date is due in large measure to the development in many communities of a local, central communal agency for Jewish education, the program for which was first worked out through the New York City Bureau of Jewish Education established in 1910 by the organized local Jewish community (Kehillah) under the inspirational leadership of Dr. Samson Benderly. It was this great pioneer who laid the foundations for an American system of Jewish education.

Local Agencies

In 1950 there were at least forty such central community agencies and others in the process of formation. Most of them were established since 1925, and more particularly since the founding of the American Association for Jewish Education in 1939.

In addition to coordinating the work of the several school units in a community, these local central agencies offer them many technical and communal services as well as financial aid. They help them in their efforts to increase pupil enrollment as well as to advance their educational standards. They provide them with scholarships for poor pupils or budgetary grants when necessary. They help them to collect tuition fees and to plan their building programs. They provide them with teachers, supervision, curricular guidance and materials, text books, audio-visual aids, extra-curricular activities specialized services, such as music, dramatics, dancing, arts and crafts, inter-school activities, participation in general community projects. They encourage these schools to extend their courses of study and to hold their pupils through the graduating classes. Some of these agencies conduct a central communal Talmud Torah or a group of associated communal schools, or a summer camp. In many

communities, they conduct a central high school for weekday afternoon pupils as well as for Sunday school pupils, sometimes also a College of Jewish Studies for graduates of high school, as well as a School for Jewish Studies for youth and adults. They conduct in-service training courses for teachers and in some places, a Teacher Training School or Department. They have specialized libraries for teachers and for public use and serve as centers for Jewish information.

They receive their funds, whether for services or for grants, from their local communal fiscal agencies, and serve them as their Jewish educational arm. The governing Boards of these central educational agencies consist of lay or rabbinical representatives of their affiliated schools and of the community at large. In and through these Boards, community programs in Jewish education are planned and carried out by all ideological groups in the community. The ideological autonomy of each school is always respected provided it adheres to the minimum standards and the official administrative regulations democratically adopted by these Boards.

The local central agencies are communal in character. They serve each school directly regardless of its ideological affiliation. In some cities where there are several schools belonging to a particular ideological group, a group affiliation with the central educational agency may be arranged. In that case, the school may receive in addition to individualized services also specialized group services. Thus these Jewish educational agencies, their affiliated schools, their governing Boards and personnel share in a highly sensitive, democratic process which reflects American as well as Jewish ideals and which influences the organizational as well as the spiritual character of the community.

Variations in Local Programs

While the several local agencies are gradually developing a common program of activity and responsibility, they do not yet operate in accordance with a common pattern of organization and function. Each of these agencies reflects the degree of Jewish cultural awareness of its respective local Jewish

population. A more recently organized Jewish agency in a smaller community may function more effectively than an older agency in a larger community. A striking example is the Bureau of Jewish Education of Los Angeles, California. Only a little more than five years old today, practically all of the several types of Jewish schools from the extreme left to the extreme right are affiliated with it, and about 70% of teachers' salaries in all of them are paid out of central community funds. A diversified curricular program, including publications and experimentation, serves the needs of the several age groups and ideological groups, and a graduated school structure from kindergarten to college and teacher training classes for all these groups has developed under a central system of supervision.

The measure of centralized direction achieved in Los Angeles is due largely to the will and authority of the local Jewish Community Council, which is one of the most representative and democratically organized in the country, and whose character is reflected in its affiliated central agency for Jewish education, for whose establishment it is largely responsible. Contrariwise, we find that in New York City where the first Bureau of Jewish Education was founded more than forty years ago, it does not yet exercise a comparable measure of centralized direction. It was in this great Jewish metropolis where a first attempt was made by the Kehillah, the organized Jewish community, under the leadership of Dr. Judah L. Magnes and Dr. Samson Benderly, to establish an organized community program of Jewish education, based on the principles of community responsibility, ideological autonomy of cooperating groups, and advanced standards. Unfortunately, because of the size of New York City's Jewish population, the forms of community organization and the sense of community responsibility have been growing slowly. When the Kehillah organization disappeared, it was succeeded by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropic Societies and the Jewish Education Association, a layman's organization, with both of whom the Bureau of Jewish Education finally merged in 1939 to form the

Jewish Education Committee of New York City. This committee continues the emphasis on improved standards, organic school structure, enriched content, experimentation, centralized supervision, ideological differentiation, wider scope of ages and institutions. While other communities have borrowed much from the enriched program of the growing New York's educational agency in terms of ideas, forms, methods and experiences, it, itself, has not yet succeeded in assuming the financial obligations or the centralized controls which agencies in smaller and better organized communities have attained. In addition, New York City constitutes a geographical problem not equally encountered in smaller communities. There the coordination of the efforts of ideological groupings may suffice. In New York City, the distribution of population calls for regional as well as ideological coordination. The efforts which the Jewish Education Committee is making in this direction may some day help to bring about a greater measure of general Jewish community organization as well as centralized educational administration.

In Chicago, however, the local Bureau program includes not only support for its College of Jewish Studies, its several departments, and its summer school camp, but also support for a diversified, ideologically autonomous system of elementary and secondary schools. This system includes Orthodox schools, but unfortunately, in this city, some of the Orthodox schools have formed a Bureau of their own. The local Welfare Fund provides most of the budget of the College and the local Bureau of Jewish Education. The latter must however wage a separate campaign for supplementary funds. On the other hand, the Bureau and the College, housed in a central educational building, have become an integral and central educational influence in the Jewish cultural life of the community.

In Philadelphia, the program of coordination of ideological groupings is outstanding. Here the schools associated with the respective Conservative, Reform, Orthodox and other groupings have their own centralized

agencies. These agencies, in turn, belong to a super central agency called the Council on Jewish Education. This Council is a part of the Allied Jewish Appeal from whom it receives its funds for support of its affiliated agencies and their respective schools. The Council supplies the agencies and schools with centralized supervision and other services. Because of the interest which the Allied Jewish Appeal has taken in its Jewish educational system, it has received outstanding cooperation from parents and Jewish school pupils.

A most advanced community-minded program has been developed in Schenectady, a community of less than 5,000 Jewish souls. Here the local community council organized a central Jewish educational agency, which helps to integrate the services of the school, the synagogue, the Center, the home and the Council through scheduling a weekly individual and group program of activities for each child in the community, whose growth can be followed by this central agency. Pupil enrollment and educational achievements have been increased. Further progress awaits greater community awareness and greater community cooperation.

Thus we see that the program and the success of a central agency in Jewish education depends in large measure on the cultural status of the local community and the degree of its organization. The Jewish educational growth of a child or youth will, in many cases, therefore, depend upon the kind of Jewish community in which he will grow up.

National Agencies

In addition to local central agencies for Jewish education, there are also national central agencies. They are ideological as well as communal in character. The Reform, the Conservative and the Orthodox groups each have a national education office and a governing Commission on Jewish Education, consisting of representatives of their respective rabbinical and congregational bodies. Some of the all-day schools have their national office and representative body known as "Torah Umesorah," and some of these schools are affiliated with the national Lubavitcher Has-

sidic group which also has its office. The Yiddish groups have three national agencies. They are the National Arbeiter Farband, the Arbeiter Ring and the Sholem Aleichem Folkschulen. (The Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order has of course its own national agency, but except for one city, its schools are not accepted in local Jewish communal agencies).

There are two national professional bodies in American Jewish education. They are the National Council for Jewish Education organized in 1926, and the Hebrew Teachers Federation of America, reorganized in 1944. To the former belong executives, supervisors, principals, authors, college and teacher-training personnel of all ideological groups. To the latter belong most of the weekday afternoon and all-day school teachers, but not the Yiddishist or Sunday school teachers. The former publishes the "Jewish Education" Magazine in English and the "Shevilei Hahinukh" in Hebrew. The latter participates in the publication of the Hebrew magazine, and publishes a special section in it dealing with organizational interests. Both organizations hold annual national as well as local conferences, devoted to pedagogic and professional interests. Their publications as well as their conferences seek to encourage higher standards of achievement among their members through stimulation of research, experimental projects, teacher-training programs, and through promotion of communal interest in their work. They also set up codes of practice and placement committees for their members, and have participated in the development of salary and welfare schedules for Jewish educational workers.

Besides the professional bodies, there is a central national agency representing the lay leadership and local communal agencies in American Jewish education. It is the American Association for Jewish Education. It was established in 1939 through the efforts of the professional workers and through their National Council. The Board of Governors of this Association consists of the presidents and other representatives of the local Bureaus of Jewish Education and of members at large. The latter include representatives from national ideological bodies, from national com-

munal organizations and from professional groups.

This Association functions as a national service, coordinating and promotional agency for American Jewish education. Its primary purpose is to help raise Jewish educational standards through promoting community planning and responsibility for local Jewish educational endeavor. It operates through its several departments. Through its Department of Research, Information and Publications, it gathers and distributes annually current facts concerning Jewish educational endeavor nationally and locally. It helps local communities to make short-range or long-range self-surveys and to organize their local efforts. It helps national agencies in special studies concerning specific aspects of current Jewish educational activity. It helps to establish standards of communal practice. It publishes Research and Information Bulletins as well as surveys and monographs.⁸

Through its Department of Personnel, the Association helps not only to supply qualified candidates for executive and higher positions required by local agencies or national bodies, but also to set up qualifications for such personnel, to enlist teacher training schools and higher institutions of Jewish learning in the training of such personnel, and to conduct a Summer-in-service Workshop for Bureau executives. Through this department it sponsors a national Board of License which helps to set up local Boards of License, qualifications for teachers and standards for teacher training schools, also local Boards of Review for establishing codes of practice, salary and welfare schedules and for arbitration of disputes. Through it, the Association cooperates with the professional organizations helps them financially, participates in the publication of their professional magazines, provides fellowships, and cooperates with Dropsie College, with the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Work and with other institutions in the training of personnel for executive or creative leadership in the field of Jewish education.

⁸This department has recently initiated a National Survey of Jewish Educational Endeavor in the United States.

Through its Department of Pedagogics and Curricular Materials the Association helps local agencies analyze local pedagogic problems and needs. Through the publication of its periodic *Pedagogic Reporter* it keeps them informed of latest developments in method of production of curricula materials. It encourages local experimentation and research in this area of school activity. Through this department it also sponsors a National Council on Jewish Audio-Visual Materials, whose membership consists of national Jewish bodies or local agencies interested in developing such materials in the teaching of children, youth or adults. This Council acts as a clearing office for the report of existing materials and their evaluation. It also seeks to stimulate the production of new materials.

Through its Department of Community Service and Consultation, the Association supplies local communities with all necessary consultation, supervisory, organizational and promotional services. It helps to initiate local surveys sometimes state-wide and regional in character, and to follow them up. It also helps them in their efforts to obtain greater local financial support for their respective programs. While this department, in cooperation with other departments, gives direct assistance to executives of local central agencies for Jewish education, it works very closely with the local lay leadership in a community. Through the Department of Promotional Services, the Association carries on a program of local and national education concerning the purposes and needs of American Jewish education. In connection with these efforts it conducts annual conferences, nationally and locally, supplies releases to the press, general and local, and publishes a periodic Jewish Education Newsletter. Through its Department of Membership it seeks local interest and financial support for its own program of activities from individuals and from Jewish welfare funds.

In many ways this Association serves local communities in Jewish education as the Office of Education in Washington serves states and cities in American education. The Association has professional and communal contacts with this government office as it does

with other agencies and organizations in the fields of American and Christian education.

Developments and Trends

Four historic developments have taken place in this country during the past fifty years, which resulted in a system of American Jewish education. They are (1) the growth of an educational structure consisting of a variety of schools and agencies described above, (2) the growth of a Jewish education profession, (3) the advancement in standards and the intensification of courses of study, and (4) the growing acceptance of local centralized community direction of and responsibility for educational endeavor. It is this last development which has very largely influenced the progress of the others, and has organically related all the component parts into a respectable educational system.

The years 1900 to 1910 saw the establishment of the American Talmud Torah or weekday afternoon school with its intensive program and idealistic European teachers. The years 1910 to 1925 saw the beginnings of the all-day school and the ideological schools, as well as the development of community agencies in some of the larger cities patterned after the Bureau of Jewish Education and the Jewish Education Association in New York City. The years 1925 to 1950 saw the spread of local central agencies, the founding of national ideological agencies and the organization of the members of the Jewish education profession into the National Council for Jewish Education. During this period we observe the opening of many high schools, colleges of Jewish studies, teacher training schools, schools for adults, classes for very young children, the Foundation School, camps with Jewish programs and Hebrew-speaking camps. During this period, too, we find Hebrew introduced into the public high schools and colleges. These multiple developments or trends are notable especially during the past ten years, when most of these schools and agencies grew in number, when teachers' qualifications were raised, and supervision improved, when new methods and materials were produced, when the percentage of enrollment increased, when contri-

butions from local welfare funds were raised, and when a national central agency, the American Association for Jewish Education was organized. Supreme among all historic events during this period is, of course, the reestablishment in 1948 of the State of Israel. That event has already begun to stimulate interest in Jewish education in many communities.

Summary

This brief summary tells the story of progress in American Jewish education during the first half of the twentieth century. It traces the development of existing Jewish schools in America from their lowly, individualistic and idealistic origins to their present democratic community sponsorship as a system of organically related and diversified units. Because of this development these schools are enabled to function as an integral part of the cultural and religious life of the general American population.

Unsolved Problems

Welcome and significant as is the record of this program, Jewish educational endeavor in America still faces many crucial and unsolved problems. Only a few of them can be listed here. From a social point of view, the most difficult problem is that of schedule and double schooling. Some parents have solved their individual problems by sending their children to all-day schools. Others have demanded a reduction in the weekday afternoon schedule. The latter solution has weakened the effectiveness of the afternoon school. The quantity and quality of its teaching has been reduced and so has its holding powers. Pupils remain in many of them for only a two-year period. A partial solution to this problem is offered in the plan of the Foundation School. It is however, a very costly plan and thus far can provide for only a limited number of pupils. Other solutions are being sought in terms of school structure and program. Suggestions have been offered for a three year elementary school for children, ages 8 to 11, to be followed by a Junior High School, ages 11 to 14. The elementary school would emphasize Jewish experience and participation in home, synagogue and community

activity, with their correlative learnings, to make up for a growing lack of Jewish experience in the home. The emphasis on language and literary studies would be postponed to the maturer level of the Junior High School. Whether this arrangement will increase the holding power and achievement of the weekday afternoon school is a matter of experimentation.

Another aspect of the weekday school problem is the Talmud Torah. Jews have moved to new neighborhoods where they set up synagogues with their respective congregational units. The Talmud Torahs in the old neighborhoods lose their wealthier supporters and parents. They become schools for the poor. They have no substitute sources of income except such as the central agency for Jewish education can provide. The problem for the Talmud Torah in the poor neighborhoods, including those of special housing projects, becomes the responsibility of the community as a whole. Even if some congregations should extend scholarships, their income may not even permit them to care for these children without additional community help.

From a pedagogic point of view, the problems of content and method are quite complex. How much subject matter can be offered in a *weekday* course of study in the elementary school? How much time can be devoted to book knowledge and how much to activity? How much shall school experience make up for the lack of home experience? How can the content of the Jewish studies be best related to general studies? How can the past be related to the present? How can the classical Jewish traditions be best related to ideals of American democracy? What place shall the new experience and cultural developments in Israel be given in the Jewish school curriculum? How can the answers to all these questions be developed through text books and other materials? These problems are also involved in the relationship between the Jewish school, the Jewish center and the synagogue. These problems affect all types of schools.

Another related problem is that of the Jewish home. It used to be the inspirational

source of Jewish behavior and the guardian of Jewish knowledge and experience. The American Jewish home is gradually becoming devoid of all these assets. How can the American Jewish educational system restore the home to its historic function in Jewish education?

Despite progress towards a community program in Jewish education, local and central agencies in Jewish education will have great difficulties in coordinating the various types of schools and obtaining their effective cooperation in inter-school activity.

From the point of view of finances, perhaps the most crucial problem is the efforts needed to arouse community interest and responsibility for Jewish education. Despite recent increases in such interest and responsibility, the relative community support given by Jewish welfare funds to their respective local educational agencies in many cities is still very low. Nor have synagogues, parents or community leaders fulfilled their due share of responsibility for the Jewish educational needs of their own families or for those of the total community.

Then there is the problem of a Jewish educational program for rural communities and for small communities. Regional bureaus, correspondence courses and summer camps are all being tried out.

Finally, there is the problem of personnel, lay and professional. The problems of American Jewish education cannot be solved without more lay interest and community leadership. Equally urgent is the need for qualified professional leaders and workers in the field of Jewish education.

These problems will find their eventual solution, and a more effective system of American Jewish education will be evolved, when Jewish communities in America will become concerned with Jewish education as a means of personality enrichment for their children and themselves, and with Jewish cultural activity as a continuation to the spiritual welfare of America.

Prospect

The year 1951, which begins the second half of the century, already registers the ten-

sions and conflicts of an armed world divided into two camps. Russian communism and its adherents in Europe and Asia menaces American democracy and its allied European countries. Another world war threatens all reconstructive measures of the United Nations, of the youthful State of Israel and of American Jewry. The American Jewish community will need to summon all its accumulated and revitalized spiritual powers to face the trials and tribulations which may befall world Jewry. If, with God's help, new world catastrophes are averted, then the rehabilitation of world Jewry and of the State of Israel will require continued assistance, and together with the rest of mankind, Jews will have to concern themselves increasingly with the spiritual and social values in life. To fulfill these tasks, including the meeting of its own philanthropic and cultural needs, American Jewry must fortify itself spiritually. To that end the American Jewish community must restore Jewish education to the supreme place and role which it commanded in Jewish community life historically.

To make possible the attainment of this end, the provision of funds alone will not suffice. There will have to be a greater awareness on the part of the American Jewish community and its leadership of the purposes and content of Jewish education. The Jewish community will have to afford Jewish education social motivation, stability and continuity as a communal asset. It will have to help Jewish education elevate its goals and standards and intensify its creative resourcefulness. It must help Jewish education serve as an integrating influence in the development of individual personality and Jewish community character and as a link between the spiritual resources of Israel and American Jewry, so that it may contribute spiritual values to American democracy and absorb American democratic values within Jewish community life. Whether an expanded and vitalized American Jewish educational system can succeed in the achievement of these aims will depend both on world events and on the will of the American Jewish community, more especially, upon its responsible leaders.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

A Syllabus

PREPARED BY

STEWART G. COLE

With the Assistance of a Seminar Group

FOR

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
(Golden Anniversary Convention)

AND

THE COMMISSION ON RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

OF

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, INC.

Introduction

THIS SYLLABUS was prepared by the undersigned at the conclusion of a six-month's seminar held at Los Angeles in which the following persons participated:

Leonard Beerman, Rabbi, Leo Baeck

Temple

Stewart G. Cole, Education, The National Conference of Christians and Jews

John Collins, S.J., Religion, Loyola University

Samuel Dinin, Bureau of Jewish Education

Darrell X. Finnegan, S.J., Education,

Loyola University

Paul B. Irwin, Religious Education, University of Southern California

Abraham Kaplan, Philosophy, University of California at Los Angeles

Jesse Moses, Social Studies, Pasadena City College

Clinton A. Neyman, Chaplain, University of Southern California

Hubert Noble, Chaplain, Occidental College

This study guide will be used at the workshop in "Religious Education and Intercultural Relationships" at the fiftieth anniversary convention of the Religious Education Association at the University of Pittsburgh, November 8-10, 1953. Readers are cordially invited to study the syllabus, examine the readings, and share in the proposed workshop. It is hoped that out of the deliberations of the group that convenes in Pittsburgh will emerge a document that high points the opportunities and obligations of religious

leadership in America with respect to the improvement of intercultural relations throughout this country.

STEWART G. COLE,

*Director of Education, National Conference of Christians and Jews,
Los Angeles, California.*

I. America Is Many Peoples

1. America is many significant phenomena. With respect to its peoples, it is a large scale demonstration of how transplanted peoples, cultures, and religions from all over the world have been building in our Western World a democratic way of life. The process of building has been extensive and is experimental and on-going.

2. The peoples and cultures sharing in the American experiment include a wide diversity of culture groups. They represent majority and minority (dominant and disadvantaged) groups and differ racially (Caucasian, Negro, Mongolian and mixtures), religiously (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and other sects and faiths), in family origin (Anglo, Belgian, Chinese, Danish and so on), and in socio-economic status (upper, middle and lower social classes) in community life.

The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1947, defines:

The majority group: "The dominant majority . . . Caucasian, English-speaking, Protestant, and of comparatively distant Anglo-Saxon or European background."

The minority group: "a group which is treated or which regards itself as a people apart. It is distinguished by cultural or physical characteristics, or both."

Brown and Roucek: (*One America, 1952*) introduce the reader to forty-one "minority peoples."

3. The American peoples are devoted to a democratic way of life. Its basic values are inscribed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Gettysburg Address and the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, as well as in the hearts of Americans.

4. This multi-culture orientation of the American way of life with its unique value system raises important questions for the religious educators of America:

- (1) How well oriented are the religious forces of America in the field of inter-cultural relations?
- (2) What do we infer by way of social dominance when it is said that the White-Anglo-Protestants constitute the majority group in the United States?
- (3) What is the implication, not only numerically but socially and psychologically, of the concept "a minority group"? How basically in pattern and purpose do minority groups (a) differ from the majority group, (b) differ from each other, and (c) agree in their Americanism?
- (4) In what measure do the interactions of the majority and minority groups in community and national life square with ideals of democracy and the precepts of the Judean-Christian tradition? What specific illustrations support your viewpoint? What contradict it?

II. *Intercultural Issues Facing America*

1. America, like any democratic society, faces many problems in human relationships. In this syllabus we are concerned with those issues cutting across racial, religious, socio-economic and cultural lines which affect adversely the well-being of American citizens and which lay a responsibility upon the forces of religion to deal intelligently and ethically with them.

The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights:

"From our work as a Committee, we have learned much that has shocked us, and much that has made us feel ashamed."

Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas, May 12, 1948, addressing the House Committee on Education and Labor:

"The world will not trust us if we talk out of both sides of our mouth, if we are on one side abroad and on another side at home. Two-thirds of the world's people are colored. We cannot expect that they will respect our good faith or our avowed purposes if we continue to practice any ugly discrimination here at home against our own minorities. In the interest of our national defense we must not permit prejudices and discrimination to become our Achilles heel."

Will Alexander, *Racial Segregation in the American Protestant Church* (Friendship Press, 1946):

"So complete is the acceptance of the segregation pattern by the church that common fellowship between white and colored Christians is awkward and unsatisfactory. While people of color are not absolutely barred by rule from so-called white congregations, the self-consciousness and resentment that this preserves in the congregation and arouses in the fellowship of the church are such as to bar them from freedom of worship and fellowship with such congregations."

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953):

"The fight for freedom today is, in a real sense, a fight for the idea of brotherhood.

"This idea touches every value we cherish. It presupposes the dignity of every human being as a child of God. It expresses the honor and the respect which every man, therefore, owes his neighbor. It appeals to the spirit of comradeship and the practice of cooperation which are essential, telling marks of a democracy."

2. Among the issues of an intercultural character disturbing the American people, six of the most persistent, acute and uni-

versal problems are presented here. They are (a) race tensions; (b) first-class versus second-class citizenship; (c) religious group conflicts; (d) group diversity versus national unity; (e) the American dilemma; and (f) social prejudice.

By race tensions we mean the stresses and strains, sometimes resulting in violence, which continue to prevent or disrupt democratic relationships between white and colored peoples, particularly between whites and Negroes, although also between whites and Indians, Orientals, Puerto Ricans or Filipinos.

By first-class versus second-class citizenship we mean a stratification of our society in which old stock, advantaged Americans use various devices "to keep in their places" immigrant, colored and otherwise disadvantaged peoples.

By religious group conflicts we refer not only to those disagreements between members of the different religious faiths that lead to interpersonal and intergroup tensions, but also to those separatist forces within the Jewish, Catholic and Protestant groups which contribute to their disunion and disharmony.

By the American problem of group diversity versus national unity we mean the issue of reconciling as a structural purpose in our democracy the relative merits of cultural pluralism (the rights of culture groups to self perpetuation if they so desire) and of political, social and cultural solidarity of the American people.

By the American dilemma we mean the ethically embarrassing cultural situation of which the American people are becoming acutely conscious, namely, the moral cleavage between the high standards and values in human relationships which we set for ourselves in a democracy and the obvious disregard of these values and standards in many situations in this country involving minority peoples.

By social prejudice we mean an unfavorable attitude assumed by a person toward a member of an out-group because of that membership and without sufficient consideration of the facts, tending to set in-group and out-group persons farther apart as fellow citizens.

How Children Learn About Human Rights
(Federal Security Agency, U.S. Office of Education, 1951):

"Teachers actually begin the study of human rights with their children in the earliest years. Although prejudice may not be expressed in words until boys and girls are in the middle years of the elementary school, they are probably felt by children in the primary grades if teachers, parents, or other adults give them a bad example. Teachers need to work with parents on this problem in study groups or conferences. Such prejudices may become a fixed part of the individual's personality that no amount of later education can change."

3. As religious educators we need to examine these issues and ask ourselves some searching questions about them.

- (1) Are the problems mentioned here representative of those facing the American people in the field of intercultural relations? Would you add others?
- (2) Are the definitions of the issues sufficiently clear to locate the problems in American life?
- (3) What relative place do these issues have in a program of religious education for a local church or synagogue?

III. Race Tensions

1. There are sixteen million Negroes in the United States, approximately one-tenth of the American population. Added to these colored people are several hundred thousand Indians, Orientals, Puerto Ricans, Filipinos and other non-Caucasians. They are distinguished physically from each other and from Caucasians who belong to another racial grouping. The color bar has historically divided the people of the United States into "the haves" and "have-nots," the Negroes in particular suffering the role of a caste position. In recent decades colored peoples have been rejecting their inferior status and demanding fair and just treatment as inheritors of the American democratic tradition.

Booker T. Washington:

"There has been no case of segregation of Negroes in the United States that has

not widened the breach between the two races. Wherever a form of segregation exists it will be found that it has been administered in such a way to embitter the Negro and harm more or less the moral fibre of the white man. That the Negro does not express this constant sense of wrong is no proof that he does not feel it."

Gunner Myrdal (*The American Dilemma*, 1944):

"The Negro should partake of the burdens and benefits of the public economy like other citizens in similar circumstances."

Elmo Roper (CBS radio address, "Where The People Stand"):

is responsible for the statement that discrimination against the Negroes costs the American people five billion dollars a year.

2. The churches have contributed directly and indirectly to the maintenance of Jim-Crowism in America. Although some leaders in the Judeo-Christian tradition have taken strong stands for the complete elimination of cast from our society in the interests of brotherhood, the rank and file of local church groups have remained largely indifferent. Since ninety-five per cent of the Negro people identified with the church belong to the forces of Protestant Christianity, the problem of accepting them is especially a responsibility of Caucasian Protestants. The following quotations suggest the importance of the problem:

Liston Pope (*Survey Graphic*, 1947):

"If the white churches attempt to abolish racial segregation within their fellowship it is probable that many whites, having missed or rejected the import of the Christian teaching about race, will repudiate their membership. It is even more likely, however, that they will seek to preserve their dominance in the churches and to oppose all attempts at racial segregation."

John La Farge (*Survey Graphic*, 1947):

"There are four types of segregation in the Roman Catholic Church: 'the traditional,' a survival of historic patterns;

'compensatory segregation,' such as missionary work directed at Negroes; 'theoretical or planned segregation' as a rationalization and 'the best way to handle the problem'; and 'voluntary segregation' in which, for example, Negroes elect their own sisterhood."

Frank S. Loescher (*The Protestant Church and the Negro*, 1948):

".... only one-tenth of one percent of the Negro Protestant Christians of the United States worship regularly with fellow Christians of other races."

The Federal Churches of Christ in America ("The Church and Race Relations," 1946):

"Segregation as practiced in America probably has more effect upon the racial opinion of the young than formal teachings of the schools about democracy or of the Church about Christian brotherhood

The Federal Council hereby renounces the pattern of segregation in race relations and requests its constituents to do likewise. As proof of their sincerity in this renunciation, they will work for a non-segregated church and a non-segregated society."

3. As religious educators we need to clarify our thinking with respect to racial tensions in America. We need to decide what more we can do to eliminate the evils of segregation and to welcome the colored peoples into the main stream of American life. Let us consider:

- (1) What significant movements are the religions of America supporting that are helping wipe out the evils of discrimination and segregation in community life?
- (2) What, in your judgment, are the most encouraging trends in church practices in the various religious faiths contributing to the elimination of segregation?
- (3) What are the high points in the religious education program of your church or synagogues concerning (a) the meaning of race, (b) the problems in race relations in America, (c) the

the correction of stereotype ideas about white and colored peoples, and (d) the stimulation of better Judean or/and Christian attitudes between white and colored peoples?

- (4) Do your religious education materials suggest specific kinds of interracial cooperation in community life for the purpose of eliminating segregation and developing a harmonious citizenship? If so, what are they and how are these suggestions being implemented?
- (5) Fundamentally, what do the rank and file of Negroes, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos and Puerto Ricans want as American citizens? Are religious educators in sympathy with their basic desires? If so, how can church and synagogue programs help them achieve these ends?

IV. *First-Class vs. Second-Class Citizenship*

1. Traditionally, the Protestant Anglo-Saxon people have set the culture pattern in most communities throughout America. Non-Protestants and non-Anglos who migrated to America accepted a lower social rating in the community scale, and represented a diversity of non-white, non-English-speaking, Catholic or/and Jewish culture groups. Every urban center became a polygot society with a "Little Italy," Chinatown, Black Belt, Germantown, Bohemia, and so on. Not only did a horizontal "social distance" spring up between the dominant group and these minorities, but the Anglos tended to "grade" them vertically in a relative scale of social acceptance. The Anglos regarded themselves as first-class citizens and the peoples of minority groups as second-class citizens. The following quotations suggest the problem:

Ruth Tuck, *Not With the Fist: Mexican-Americans in a Southwest City* (1946):

"The stereotype of the immigrant runs somewhat as follows: he is of low intelligence, 'drunk,' lives like an animal, has brute strength, little higher nature, drinks too much, produces too many children, is either improvident and reckless with money or grasping and scheming, is given to criminal behavior, and is incapable of

becoming a 'real American.'"

The President's Committee on Civil Rights:

"The United States can no longer countenance these burdens (the denial of civil rights to certain of our peoples) on its common conscience, these inroads on its moral fibre."

Mark A. May (*Education in a World of Fear*, 1941):

" . . . a democracy can tolerate a class system only so long as the boundaries between the classes are not fixed and impermeable. Individuals should be free to move from one class level to another on the basis of talent and capacity for service. The internal threat to democracy is not the existence of a class system but the closing of the doors to social mobility through education. As these doors seem to be closing one by one, our fears for the future of democracy increase."

James Bryant Conant (*Education in a Divided World*, 1948):

"It would be my guess that so far the sum total effect of all the changes in American life since the 1870's has been to increase the stratification of American society."

Census Bureau (1951) reported that:

"The top fifth of the people in this country received forty-seven percent of the nation's money income, while the bottom fifth got three percent."

Yaroslav J. Chyz and Read Lewis (*The Annals*, March, 1949):

"An Italian Catholic parish in the United States differs from a Catholic parish in Italy in very much the same way that a Protestant Episcopal congregation differs in its structure, scope and mode of activities from a congregation of the Episcopal Church in England. An American newspaper in the Polish language is to a Pole in Warsaw as the New York Times is to a Londoner. Even such directly transplanted institutions as the German Turnverein or the Czech Sokols, or such ritualistic strict bodies as the Orthodox congrega-

tion of the Russian Orthodox churches, have developed characteristics and acquired peculiarities which single them out as 'American' in the eyes of the original organizations."

The Bureau of Applied Social Research ("How Writers Perpetuate Stereotypes," 1949):

The Bureau made a study at the request of the Writers' War Board "of the treatment accorded white, Protestant Anglo-Saxons in mass media as against the treatment accorded all other elements of the American population." The Bureau discovered that in one hundred and eighty-five short stories appearing in the most popular magazines "overwhelming attention is given to Anglo-Saxons The behavior of (non-Anglo-Saxons) fictional characters could easily be used to prove that the Negroes are lazy, the Jews wiley, the Irish superstitious and the Italians criminal." In one hundred motion pictures presenting either Negro themes or Negro characters of more than passing significance the Bureau "found that seventy-five presented stereotyping or disparaging views of Negroes."

2. The religious educator faces a society that has permitted undemocratic and non-Judeo-Christian standards of grading and evaluating persons and culture groups to spring up and become normative devices in the intergroup relations of our citizens. He also faces within his own religious group local congregations and parishes which differ widely in relative social, economic and cultural acceptance and opportunities to realize the values of the American way of life.

(1) What bearing have the following conditions or practices, which are widespread in America, upon an individual's sense of belonging and acceptance as a citizen of the United States: Jim-Crow (or lily-white) laws, discriminatory folkways, "gentlemen's agreements" in real estate transactions, segregated schools and churches, the quota system in colleges and graduate schools, poll taxes, ghetto-like neighborhoods, stereotype ideas about minority peoples, and the like?

- (2) As a matter of American principle, who is a first-class citizen and who is a second-class citizen?
- (3) Psychologically and ethically, what happens to the personalities of individuals who (a) suffer from discrimination or segregation, enduring the feelings of second-class citizenship, or (b) as "first-class citizens," subject others to discrimination or segregation?
- (4) How can the advantages of first-class citizenship be shared more fully and freely with those individuals and groups which still suffer from handicaps of a second-class status?
- (5) Specifically, how do the social activities and educational program of your church or synagogue contribute to the upward mobility of the less-favored persons and culture groups in the social scale of the community?
- (6) In a multi-culture and class-structured society such as we have in America, is it inevitable that the practices of second-class citizenship be perpetuated?
- (7) If you are a religious educator serving in a church or synagogue whose members are relatively advantaged socially and culturally, what kind of an educational program is advisable to help them understand the subservient roles that other peoples (and churches and synagogues) are enduring, and to help them change the pattern of their lives to share with out-groups the opportunities and satisfactions of first-class citizenship?
- (8) If you are a religious educator serving in a church or synagogue whose members are more or less disfavored in the social folkways and mores of America, what kind of educational program are you introducing to help youth and adults throw off their feelings of social inferiority and acquire the rights and responsibilities of first-class citizenship?
- (9) What are religious educators doing to help the children and youth of foreign-speaking parents to appreciate the dignity and worth of the older generations' cultural traits, and at the same time to urge the parents to permit their chil-

dren to become acculturated in the prevailing American folkways of the public school and community?

(10) Do religious textbooks and reference readings contain stereotype ideas about racial, religious, nationality or socio-economic groups? Is it desirable to have a study made to evaluate the materials of your church or synagogue?

V. Religious Group Conflicts

1. The literal meaning of religion is a binding together. Ironically, the religious peoples in America are divided not only into separate faiths but, not infrequently, into opposing social forces. There are at least two broad areas of religious intergroup conflicts in this country today.

2. Between Jews and Christian semitism — antisemitism tension continues, although the conflict is perhaps not as sharp as it was a decade ago. The members of the in-group (whether Jewish or Christian), in so far as they become identified with intergroup conflict, build up exaggerated ideas about their self-importance (ethnocentrism) and derogatory notions about members of the out-group (stereotypy). For example, some Christians charge Jews with entertaining a false idea of their choseness and some Jews criticize Christians for teaching that "the Jews crucified Christ."

How Secure These Rights? (1949):

"It is in the areas of education, employment, fraternal organizations, housing and interpersonal relationships that discrimination against Jews is most extensive, and increasingly so."

George Washington (writing to a Hebrew Congregation in New Port, Rhode Island):

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the govern-

ment of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they live under its protection and should demeanor themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

3. Between present-day Catholics and Protestants, especially certain leaders, a number of issues have arisen involving charges, counter-charges and considerable acrimony on both sides. Most of the issues center around differences of opinions about the application of the principle of the separation of church and state with respect to federal aid to education, the delegation of an American ambassador to the Vatican, and the like.

The activities of the organization, "Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State," have aroused in many Protestants anti-Catholic sentiments and led to the instituting of a powerful protestant lobby in Washington, D. C. A number of Catholic leaders have felt obliged to meet these attacks and defend their church's role in America. Beneath the surface of the issues are not only ideological differences but an inter-religious struggle for power in the cultural life of America. The numerical and social strength of Catholicism has grown noticeably in recent decades, challenging the historic dominance of Protestantism in American society.

Gregory IX, (1233):

"Christians must show towards the Jews the same kindness that we wish to have shown toward Christians who live in pagan lands."

The Christian Century (February 26, 1947):

"Catholicism has become a strong formidable minority . . . If Protestantism tolerates any compromise of the principle of the equality of all religious faiths before the American state, it seals its own destiny."

America, (1952):

"When it comes to cooperation with non-Catholics far too many Catholics are 'more Catholic than the Pope.' They shy

away from all collaboration with those not of the Faith, even in such purely temporal affairs as the promotion of civil rights and agitation for slum clearance. They suffer it seems from a vague fear that to do so would contribute to the spread of religious indifferentism. The Holy Father, on the other hand, has issued so many appeals for cooperation of Catholics with their non-Catholic fellow-citizens during the decade of his reign that he can justly be called the Pope of Cooperation. He has termed such cooperation 'necessary and urgent.'

Social Action (May, 1952):

"The psychological basis of much of American Protestantism lies in a negative rejection of Roman Catholicism The one emotional loyalty that of a certainty binds us together as Protestants is the battle against Rome."

Prejudice in Textbooks: (Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 160) has reported what the textbooks in the public schools of America contain or omit:

"Most of the materials about Jews in texts is about ancient Jews Less than 12 per cent of the texts even mentioned the existence of the Jews as a modern religious group. In a few which do discuss the Jewish religious developments of today, there is usually only a fleeting reference to cooperation among Catholics, Protestants and Jews, on some of the basic social questions of the day."

4. The religious educator faces situations involving tensions and conflicts between Jews and Christians and between Catholics and Protestants. They contribute to the defeat of a basic purpose of religion in society. For this reason he cannot afford to disregard them. On the one hand, he needs to help his people analyze their attitudes and beliefs about members of religious out-groups to root out every vestige of arrogance or intolerance that lingers in them. He should also help his people to examine their teaching materials to find out if they include any uncomplimentary ideas about other religions which engender prejudice.

On the other hand, should the religious educator orient his people in the abc's of

other religious faiths, he can inspire in them a respect for out-group peoples, even though they may reject the beliefs of these peoples. Such a religious educational policy would not lead a devotee of a particular faith to assume (a) that all religions are equally important, (b) that he should lessen his devotion to his own religion because he is encouraged to be understanding of other persons and their religious heritage, or (c) that he should encourage a melting down of the various religions rooted in America into one inclusive faith. Such assumptions are unrealistic and contrary to the conscience of many religious groups. The religious educational proposal suggested here affords a basis for encouraging the members of each faith to be (a) genuinely loyal to their own religion, (b) appreciative of the significant beliefs and values of other faiths, and (c) committed to helping resolve the tensions between religions and cooperative with other religious groups in community affairs.

As religious educators face the conflicts that engage so many of their people, they may well raise questions such as the following:

- (1) How can a man who is devoted to his religious faith avoid feelings of in-group superiority in his attitude toward the members of other religious faiths?
- (2) How can a religious faith, Jewish, Catholic or Protestant that has been authoritarian in its traditional patterns function in a society dedicated to the principles of democracy?
- (3) What assumptions (a) theological and (b) psychological lie at the roots of America's religious conflicts? Can we face them together and do something to reconcile them in the interests of improving human relationships among members of the various religious faiths?
- (4) Fundamentally, what are your religious educational purposes with respect to those who belong to religious out-groups? Do they contribute to ethnocentrism or mutual respect, to a divided and hostile community or to a position of agreeing to differ and resolving to love?

- (5) Have you made a careful survey of your religious education materials to find out what they present about out-group religions? Do they avoid the perpetuation of stereotypes, disrespect, and false information about them? Do they do justice to the high values advocated by these groups?
- (6) How is your religious faith attempting educationally to deal with the widespread practices of antisemitism? and to cultivate a democratic attitude toward members of the Jewish faith?
- (7) How, specifically, is your religious faith attempting to meet educationally the difficult problems inciting suspicion, illwill, and rivalry between Protestants and Catholics?
- (8) Is religious proselytism in a democratic society a socially acceptable practice? If not, what shall educators do about it? If so, how shall they deal with the proselytizing efforts of religious out-groups?
- (9) Within the framework of your religious faith, what can you do to help your people understand, appreciate, and cooperate with the members of other religions in meeting community issues in human relations?
- (10) What, specifically, can Jews, Catholics and Protestants unite in doing at the community level which demonstrates the strength of their humanitarian impulses, without compromising the significance of their religious distinctions?
- (11) What unique intergroup services can be contributed to the American way of life by (a) the Religious Education Association, (b) the National Conference of Christians and Jews (c) and other inter-religious organizations?

VI. *Group Diversity Versus National Unity*

1. Another basic problem in American democracy is how to reconcile the diversity of human interests of the various social, economic, cultural and religious groupings in this country with the cultivation of a strong unity of the American people. In other words, individuals and groups must retain their freedom to be different if they so desire, while at the same time they need to be

united in beliefs and loyalties in order to develop "one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all." Ethically, it is a problem of balancing the principles of freedom and responsibility in individual, group and intergroup behavoir. America's motto *E Pluribus Unum*, poses the issue.

Carl S. Becker (*Freedom and Responsibility in the American Way of Life*, 1945):

"The central problem of all political philosophy (the problem of social and cultural philosophy) and practice (is) the problem of the one and the many — the difficulty being to reconcile the desirable liberties of the individual with the necessary power of government in such a way as to do justice as well as may be to the desires and the interests of all individuals and classes in society."

2. The American people have been successful in demonstrating politically how a democratic tradition operated through many state autonomies and the Federal Union, by means of a superior system of checks and balances. However, in racial, ethnic and religious relations the principle "out of many oneness" of understanding and harmony has not been convincingly achieved. On the contrary, there is evidence of misunderstanding, tension, prejudice, discrimination, bigotry and intolerance in many directions, as we have witnessed in the earlier sections of this syllabus. Ethnocentrism and stereotypy exaggerate the importance of differences, breed intergroup rivalry, destroy the sinews of democratic unity, and negate the ideals of brotherhood.

3. The religious educator helps his people decide what social goals will serve as their guide in reconciling group differences within the frame work of American democracy. For instance, they may support the traditional dominance of the white-Anglo-Protestant group in American society. If so, they press for the cultural sovereignty of this group at the expense of minority groups, which must be content to accept a second-class position in this country.

Or, they may believe that the "melting-pot" principle holds out the best promise for harmony and progress in a multi-culture Ameri-

ca, in which case they direct their educational program to encourage the process of social assimilation of all peoples in community life.

Or, they *may* choose as a goal that of cultural heterogeneity. If so, they believe that every group has an inherent right to liberty and should therefore be free to develop its own distinctions, in so far as they do not interfere with the rights of other groups to do likewise. Following this lead, the religious educator would advocate the principle of tolerance as the democratic means by which a diversity of culture groups can live and let live.

Or again, a religious group *may* arrive at the conclusion that no one of these three purposes—Anglo-conformity, the melting pot, or cultural pluralism and tolerance—is an adequate answer to the issue of reconciling group diversity and national unity. If so, they will feel compelled to work out a more adequate and effective philosophy for directing their educational activities.

Israel Zangwell (*The Melting Pot*, 1923):

"The real American has not yet arrived. He is only in the Crucible. I tell you—he will be the fusion of all races, the coming superman."

Robert M. McIver (*Group Relations and Group Antagonism*, 1944):

"Only when differences are free to stay apart or to breed new variations of the community theme can human personality have fulfilment and creative power, drawing sustenance where it finds its proper nourishment, neither clinging to likeness nor worshipping differences."

E. George Payne (Brown and Rousek, *One America*, 1945):

" . . . no culture contains all favorable elements, but each group that makes up the total American population has unique values, and the nation will be richer and finer in its cultural make-up if it conserves the best that each group has brought . . . the minority groups have been so thoroughly conditioned by their heritages that the historic past could not be sacrificed even if they chose to forget the past experiences. Their values, characters, and

personalities are built out of cultures different from our own, and the method of effective cultural transmission requires that the fundamentals of their heritages be preserved for generations. The only other opinion is cultural deterioration, the disintegration of family life and maladjustment in our social life."

Joshua L. Leibman (*New York Times*, February 17, 1952):

"Tolerance is the positive and cordial effort to understand another's beliefs, practices and habits without necessarily sharing or accepting them."

The following questions concern religious educators:

- (1) Why should the problem of cultural diversity versus national unity challenge religious educators?
- (2) In a multi-culture and class-structured society, such as America represents, is any one of the following types of community life an adequate social goal for our democracy? (a) Anglo-Protestant dominance? (b) a groupless and classless society (the melting pot)? or (c) cultural pluralism and tolerance? If no one of them, then what does *E Pluribus Unum* imply and how can it be adequately implemented?
- (3) What is a sound and workable principle governing interpersonal and intergroup relationships where conflict is involved (a) between the Jewish and Christian faiths? (b) between Catholic and Protestant faiths? or (c) between the forces of religion and those of materialistic secularism?
- (4) What is the real test of tolerance in the relationship of Jews and Christians or Catholics and Protestants?
- (5) Has the educational materials of your religious faith given adequate attention to the questions raised above? If so, how are they helping the youth and adults of your religion to implement the principle of *E Pluribus Unum* in their social behavior? If not, how can the materials and practices of religious education be strengthened at this point?

VII. *The American Dilemma*

1. The American people are becoming sensitive to the fact that there is a considerable gap between the standards of excellency they have set for themselves in a democracy and in their respective religions *and* the in-humanitarian practices in human relationships which they perpetuate in our day. This is a favorable sign. It means that social conscience is at work and that an increasing number of persons want to square deeds with creed in their interpersonal and inter-group behavior. Evidences of this trend are to be seen in numerous directions, including the improvement of social amenities across racial and cultural lines in the community, the breakdown of segregational fences, the adoption by trade unions of open membership policies, the mobility upwards of lower-class and second and third generation immigrant peoples, and the decisions of the Supreme Court with respect to various aspects of civil rights.

Notwithstanding these achievements, the intergroup situation in this country is still a chequered one. There are innumerable instances where peoples are still deprived of justice, equality and brotherhood because of their race, creed, national origin or social class. Every American is familiar with the current attacks on civil rights by self-constituted protectors of the American way of life who easily charge social-minded persons with being subversive. He recognizes the entrenched powers of bi-culturalism across race lines in the North as well as in the South, affecting many social institutions including those of religion. He has noted the folkways and mores imposing second-class citizenship upon many non-Anglo, immigrant peoples. These social conditions focus a moral dilemma of the nation which requires a basic resolution if the American way of life is to become the equity of all the people.

Gunnar Myrdal has interpreted this impasse in Negro-white relations in his monumental study, *The American Dilemma* (1944). His thesis, which follows, aptly describes the whole gamut of undemocratic intercultural relations throughout the country.

Myrdal says:

"The American Negro problem is a problem in the heart of the American. It is there the interracial tension has its focus. It is there that the decisive struggle goes on. This is the central viewpoint of this treatise. Though our study includes economic, social and political race relations, at bottom our problem is the moral dilemma of the American—the conflict between his moral valuations on various levels of consciousness and generality. The 'American Dilemma' referred to in the title of this book, is the ever-raging conflict between, on the one hand, the valuations preserved on the general plane which we shall call the American Creed, where the American thinks, talks and acts under the influence of high national and Christian precepts, and, on the other hand, the valuations on specific local interests; economic, social and sexual jealousies; considerations of community prestige and conformity; group prejudice against particular persons or types of people; and all sorts of miscellaneous wants, impulses, and habits dominate his outlook.

"The moral struggle goes on within people and not only between them. As people's valuations are conflicting, behavior normally becomes a moral compromise. There are no homogeneous attitudes behind human behavior but a mesh of struggling inclinations, interests, and ideals, some held conscious and some suppressed for long intervals but all active in bending behavior in their direction."

The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights:

"The pervasive gap between our aims and what we actually do is creating a kind of moral dry-rot which eats away at the emotional and rational bases of democratic beliefs."

A survey of ethical convictions of representative citizens (*Ladies Home Journal*, November, 1948) concludes:

"that a profound gulf lies between America's avowed ethical standards and the observable realities of national life. What may be more alarming is the gap between what Americans think they do and what they *do* do. The extent of this national schizophrenia is made perfectly clear by the paradox that (1) eight out of ten

Americans think that most of America's problems would be solved by absolute obedience to the law of love, and (2) eight out of ten Americans think they themselves obey the law of love. There is someone at fault. Here indeed is a revelation of man's final sin, which Luther defined as his unwillingness to admit that he is a sinner."

2. This condition in community and national life poses a major challenge to the religious educator. Presumably, he should sensitize persons to this situation and direct them to do something spiritually remedial about it.

The following questions are appropriate:

- (1) How sensitive are religious educators to the moral gravity of the American dilemma?
- (2) In what respects are contemporary world conditions making it mandatory for the forces of religion to deal trenchantly with the specifics of this dilemma?
- (3) What is the relative significance in church or synagogue programs of (a) religious education and (b) social action, as approaches to the issues in the American dilemma?
- (4) What particular success has your religious faith achieved in its educational approach to the resolution of this dilemma (a) in individual life and (b) in community relations?
- (5) Are there ways in which the educational program of religious institutions can be related directly to activity programs in the community to accelerate desirable social change and ameliorate divisive intergroup conditions? If so, what are some of them? For example, can a religious educator introduce his people to the work of the NAACP, ACLU, or NCCJ in ways that reinforce the particular services of these community agencies and at the same time lend social reality to his own program?
- (6) What spiritual resources of your religion can you as an educator draw upon to strengthen the impact of your program upon the social conscience of your people? For instance, what sanc-

tions are available? What motivations? How can sanctions become dynamic in individual and group behavior?

VIII. *Social Prejudice*

1. Five of the problems in human relationships with which this syllabus deals—race tension, first-class versus second-class citizenship, religious-group conflict, group diversity versus national unity, and the American dilemma—have one condition in common. Every person involved in these issues is a victim of social prejudice. By social prejudice we mean an unfavorable attitude assumed by a person toward a member of an out-group because of that membership and without sufficient consideration of the facts, thus tending to set in-group and out-group persons farther apart as fellow citizens. Social prejudices misrepresent and divide persons, and are an evil that a religion cannot lightly tolerate without endangering its vitality.

The American citizen who assumes that he is free from prejudice in his attitudes toward out-groups and their members may be reflecting a prejudice in that assumption. Few individuals, if any, are totally dispassionate and understanding in their innumerable relationships with persons in the five areas of this study. Prejudice is a subtle force in personality. It may be socially inherited through the family, school, church or community and thus shared as a folkway with one's own people (as, for instance, the perpetuation of partisan prejudice as white-Negro or Protestant-Catholic attitudes). Prejudice may arise out of certain ethnocentric practices of a group (as, for instance, the sense of "Chosenness" that Christians or Jews may nurture through their exaggerated belief in the providential importance of their group). It may involve the practice of stereotyping an out-group and its members (as, for instance, the belief of a favored person that the members of a socially and economically under privileged group are necessarily inferior in personal worth). Prejudice may spring out of an intergroup struggle for social advantage and power in a competitive situation (as, for example, the attitudes of neigh-

boring Negroes and "poor whites" toward each other when times are hard, or between Catholic and Protestant leaders who are seeking favorable political advantage in this country). It may be a by-product of a "hurt" personality; in this instance prejudice is a symptom of an emotional disorder, as fever is the symptom of an organic disorder (as, for instance, the commonplace practices of scapegoating and rationalization in which many insecure persons engage). Or, prejudice may grow out of a sense of social guilt, a compromising with conscience in difficult situations where the values of the American Creed or the Judaeo-Christian tradition are at stake.

Prejudice, whatever its social or psychological roots or its manifestations in discrimination, distorts personality. The consequence may be mild or intense in a wide scale of uncharitable beliefs, feelings, and behavior. In some instances the evil results in the development of an authoritarian type of personality; in others, in the growth of a respectable but socially ineffectual conservative type of personality; and in still others, in the shaping of a resigned and submissive type of personality. In many Americans, quite probably, prejudice does not become sufficiently trenchant to "type" their personalities, but it may and does "pockmark" their characters with certain more or less inexcusable bad habits in human relationships. In any case, social prejudice is an evil hurting the moral and spiritual life of him who entertains it, and frequently of him against whom the prejudice is directed. Interracial, interreligious and intercultural prejudices are too costly to tolerate lightly in these troubled times. The following quotations suggest the nature of the problem:

Brook Chisholm (quoted in the *Open Forum*, 1949) has summed up some of the evidence of misdirected behavior in our times:

"Prejudice, isolationism, the ability emotionally and uncritically to believe unreasonable things, excessive desire for material power, excessive fear of others, belief in a destiny to control others, vengeance, are all well known and recognized neu-

rotic symptoms . . . reactions of the immature, the inferior, the guilty, which are not found in the mature, integrated personality."

Ruesch and Prestwood (*Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, 1949):

"The less personal contact and experience there has been (between the prejudiced person and his victim), the more fixed the stereotypes will be. Stereotypes are really the introjected parts of the other person which in fantasy interact with the stereotype of oneself."

Anonymous:

"They wear the blind bridle of prejudice as though it were a silk hat."

Donald Lippitt (Quote: Clyde Kluckholm, *Mirror For Man*, 1949):

"It is more easy to smash the atom than to break prejudice."

Norman Cousins (*Saturday Review of Literature*, 1947) speaking of the "respectable citizen who looks the other way" when a fellow American is subject to prejudice and discrimination:

"Those who persist in looking the other way in the presence of evil exempt themselves from nothing except membership in the human family . . . the innocent bystander's lack of courage and decisiveness was the level that enabled the Nazi to move a nation and almost the world. The bystander pretended to see no evil and hear no evil when confronted with evil, and so he becomes evil's own champion."

Harry Emerson Fosdick (*Friends of the American Way of Life*, leaflet 1950):

"Race prejudice is as thorough a denial of the Christian God as atheism, and a far more common ground of apostasy."

The Bible:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might, and thy neighbor as thyself."

2. The religious educator cannot afford to treat lightly the social disease of prejudice.

It not only violates the traditions of a dynamic democracy but it vitiates the teachings of the Jewish, Christian and other religions. He needs to study its subtle character and to abet educational materials and methods that will reduce prejudice in persons. More important, he needs to prevent the miscellaneous kinds of social prejudice becoming set in children and youth, by inculcating in them intercultural attitudes of understanding, brotherhood, and cooperation for common tasks in community and national life. He needs to raise questions like the following:

- (1) What are the criteria of social prejudice in personality, and how can the religious educator become more sensitive to detect them?
- (2) What personality consequences result from (a) practicing prejudice? and (b) suffering as a victim the impact of social prejudice?
- (3) How likely are the intercultural conditions in present-day society to produce in Americans (a) the authoritarian type of personality, (b) the conservative type, (c) the submissive type, or (d) the social-minded or democratic type of personality?
- (4) How can a religious man be loyal to his own faith without acquiring ethnocentric feelings that reflect prejudice and, consequently, do direct or indirect injury to himself and to those whose loyalty is centered in another faith?
- (5) Is prejudice toward a Negro, for instance, identical in quality with prejudice toward a "new" American, a Jew or a Catholic? Does an individual's prejudice toward one group easily transfer to become prejudice toward other groups?
- (6) How can a "popular" prejudice or discrimination in a community be made unpopular?
- (7) Do the religious of America have a common ethical idealism, comparable to the American Creed, with respect to man's relationships to man, race to race, and culture group to culture group? If so, what are its main tenets?
- (8) What religious principles have your group verified as trustworthy leads for religious educators in setting up an intercultural program in a church or synagogue?
- (9) What relative value have (a) formal religious education classes and (b) informal parish activities, as procedures for the improvement of intercultural relations in a community?
- (10) In matters of religious leadership, how significant interculturally are (a) a teacher's quality of personality and (b) his educational training and skill?

IX. Improving the Methods of Religious Education

1. The forces of religious education have at their command a rather rich lore of traditions in educational programming in local churches and synagogues. They are familiar with the principles underlying the psychology of religious experience of different age groups, the main tenets of their particular religious faith, and the variety of educational procedures available to implement their program. These resources need to be organized to deal trenchantly and effectively with the issues that have been presented in this syllabus. Here are moral problems that cannot be ignored.

2. Religious educators agree that they desire to develop in children, youth and adults, of whatever faith, mature American citizens who know how to accept each other as trustees of a common American heritage, to respect each other as fellow mortals and as children of one God and Father of us all, and to live and work together for the enrichment of the democratic way of life. They may, therefore, raise the following questions:

- (1) Briefly stated, what religious principles are essential to undergird any substantial program of intercultural education in our churches and synagogues?
- (2) From the viewpoint of nurturing mature American citizens and democratic intercultural relationships among all Americans, what values can the following methods of religious education contribute? .

- (a) the formal preaching of a rabbi, priest or minister.
- (b) an informational classroom program carefully structured, as over against one subject to the principles and methods of group dynamics.
- (c) a study course in intercultural problems.
- (d) the use of intercultural audio-visual aids.
- (e) field trips to observe intergroup problems and adjustments in community life.
- (f) inter-religious meetings and hospitality programs.
- (g) intercultural camping programs.
- (h) panels including persons representing various racial, nationality and religious backgrounds sharing their distinctive viewpoints and common concerns with an audience.
- (i) Psychodrama and sociodrama in the classroom or at other church or synagogue meetings.
- (j) a fact-finding study in a particular area of intercultural relationships.

- (3) What other educational methods have you experimented with that hold out promise for enriching the services of religion in their intercultural bearings?
- (4) Is it possible for the educational representatives of the religions of America to work out together a joint approach to the mass media of public information in this country, in which the resources of religion would be marshalled to support the development of a mature citizenship in a multi-culture America?
- (5) How can the resources of theological education be enriched to provide the professional leaders of religious institutions with a more adequate orientation in the field of democratic intercultural relationships in America?

X. Readings

1. AMERICA IS MANY PEOPLES

Louis Adamic, *A Nation of Nations* (Harper, 1945)
 Francis J. Brown and J. S. Roucek (Editors), *One America* (Prentice Hall, 1951)
 Merle Curti, *The Roots of American Loyalty*, (Columbia University Press, 1946)
 Rachael Davis DuBois, *Get Together Americans*, (Harper, 1943)
 Louis M. Hacker, *The Shaping of American Tradition*, (Columbia University Press, 1947)
 Clyde Kluckhohn, *Mirror For Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life*, (Whittlesey, 1949)
 Alexander H. Leighton, *Human Relations In a Changing World*, (Dutton, 1949)
 Carey McWilliams, *Brothers Under the Skin*, (Little, Brown, 1943)
 Kenneth D. Miller, *We Who Love America*, (Friendship, 1943)
Pius XII and Human Relations, (New Orleans Institute of Social Order, 1935)
 R. A. Schermerhorn, *These Our People*, (Heath, 1949)
 John R. Scotford, *Together We Build America*, (Friendship, 1943)
 Wallace Stegner and Others, *One Nation*, (Houghton Mifflin, 1945)
 Amos N. Wilder, *The Challenge of Our Culture*, (Harper, 1946)
To Secure These Rights, Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights (1947)
 Carl Wittke, *We Who Build America*, (Prentice Hall, 1939)

2. INTERCULTURAL ISSUES FACING AMERICA

Lloyd A. Cook, *Intergroup Relations in Teacher Education*, (American Council in Education, 1951)
 Stewart G. Cole, "Trends in Intercultural Education" *Religious Education*, Jan.-Feb. 1949.
 _____, "Building a Program of Intergroup Education in a School System" *Journal of Secondary Education*, February, 1949.

_____, "Trends in Intergroup Education" *Religious Education*, Jan.-Feb. 1953.
 Howard Cummings, (Editor) *Improving Human Relations Through Classroom, School and Community Activities* (National Council for Social Studies, 1949)
 John H. Elliott, *Building Bridges Between Groups That Differ in Faith, Race, Culture* (NCCJ, 1944)
 William H. Kilpatrick and William Van Til (Editors), *Intercultural Attitudes In The Making*, (Harper, 1947)
 Hilda Taba and William Van Til (Editors), *Democratic Human Relations: Promising Practices in Intergroup Education*, (National Council for Social Studies, 1945)
 Hilda Taba and Others, *Curriculum in Intergroup Relations*, (American Council on Education, 1950)
 Hilda Taba and Others, *Diagnosing Human Relations Needs*, (American Council on Education, 1951)
 John D. Redden and Francis A. Lyan, *International Education* (Bruce, 1951)
 William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole, *Intercultural Education in American Schools*, (Harper, 1943)
 Howard E. Wilson and Others, *Intergroup Relations in Teaching Materials* (American Council on Education, 1949)

3. RACE TENSIONS

Will W. Alexander, *Racial Segregation in the American Protestant Church*, (Friendship Press, 1946)
 Ethel J. Alpenfels, *Sense and Nonsense About Race*. (Friendship, 1946)
 Ruth Benedict, *Race, Science and Politics*, (Viking, 1945)
 Ina Corrine Brown, *Race Relations in A Democracy*, (Harper, 1949)
 D. M. Cantwell, *Catholics Speak on Race Relations*, (pamphlet) (Fedes, 1952)
 H. S. Jennings and Others, *Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem*, (University Press, 1941)
 Charles Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation*, (Harper, 1943)
 Thomas Hart, *Catholic Organizations Promoting Negro-White Relations in the United States*, (Catholic University of America Press, 1947)
 Abraham Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, *The March of Oppression* (Norton, 1951)
 Otto Klineberg, *Race Differences*, (Harper, 1935)
Life editorial, "The South Awakens, Its Conscience is at Work and Its Habits are Changing," July 13, 1949.
 John LaFarge, *No Postponement: U.S. Moral Leadership and the Problem of Racial Minorities*, (Longmans, Green, 1950)
 Frank S. Losscher *The Protestant Church and the Negro*, (Associated Press, 1948)
 Rayford W. Logan, *What the Negro Wants*, (University of North Carolina Press, 1944)
 R. M. MacIver (Editor) *Discrimination and National Welfare* (Harper, 1949)
 Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth, The Fallacy of Race* (Columbia University Press, 1945)
 _____, *Statement on Race* (Schuman, 1951)
 Howard W. Odum, *Race and Rumors of Race* (University of North Carolina Press, 1943)
 Arnold M. Rose, *The Negro's Morale* (University of Minnesota Press, 1949)
Segregation in Washington. A report of the National Committee on segregation in the nation's capitol, 1946.
The Christian Way in Race Relations, a symposium, (Harpers, 1948)
The Church and Race Relations (pamphlet) (The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1946)
The Negro in America, (pamphlet) Public Affairs.
Segregation in Washington, A report of the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capitol, 1948.
 C. Howard Thurman, *Jesus and the Disinherited*, (Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949)

4. FIRST-CLASS VS. SECOND-CLASS CITIZENSHIP

Theodore Brameld, *Minority Problems in the Public Schools* (Harper, 1946)
 Spencer Brown, *They See for Themselves: A Documentary Approach to Intercultural Education*, (Harper, 1945)
 Richard Centers, *The Psychology of Social Classes* (Princeton University Press, 1949)
 Irwin L. Child, *Italian or American: The Second Generation in Conflict* (Yale University, 1943)
 Alison Davis, *Social Class Influences on Learning* (Howard University Press, 1948)
 Marcus Lee Hansen *The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant* (Augustana Historical Society, 1938)
 August Hollingshead, *Elmstown's Youth* (Wiley, 1949)
 Irene D. Jaworski, *Becoming Americans* (Harper, 1950)
 Edward N. Saveth, *American Historians and European Immigrants*, (Columbia University Press, 1948)
 Celia Stendler, *Children of Brasstown* (University of Illinois Press, 1949)
 Robert Sutherland, *Color, Class and Personality* (American Council on Education, 1942)
 Ruth D. Tuck, *Not With the First: Mexican-Americans in a Southwest City* (Harcourt, Brace, 1946)
 W. Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole, *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups* (Yale University Press, 1945)
 W. Lloyd Warner, *Democracy in Jonesville* (Harper, 1949)
 _____, *Social Class in America*. (Social Research Associates, 1949)

5. RELIGIOUS GROUP CONFLICTS

Elmer Berger, *The Jewish Dilemma* (Devin-Adair, 1945)
 George A. Coe, "Religious Authoritarianism in Our National Culture," *Religious Education*, Nov.-Dec. 1947.
 Mildred M. Eakin, *Getting Acquainted with Jewish Neighbors*, (Macmillan, 1944)
 Mildred M. Eakin and Frank Eakin, *Sunday School Fights Prejudice*, (Macmillan, 1953)
 Horace Leland Freiss and Herbert W. Schneider, *Religion in Various Cultures*, (Holt, 1932)
 Thomas C. Hall, *Background of American Culture* (Little, Brown, 1950)
 Will Herberg, "The Sectarian Conflict over Church and State," *Commentary*, November, 1952.
 Henry E. Kagan, *Changing the Attitude of the Christian toward the Jew*, (Columbia University Press, 1952)
 Benson Y. Landis, *Our Moral and Religious Resources* (The National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1953)
 Jacques Maritain, *A Christian Looks at the Jewish Question*, (Longmans, Green, 1939)
 Conrad H. Moehlmann, *The Jewish-Christian Tragedy* (Hart, 1933)
 Charles C. Morrison, *Can Protestantism Win America?* (Harper, 1948)
 John A. O'Brien, *A Catholic Platform of Goodwill* (pamphlet, NCCJ)
 James O'Neil, *Catholicism and American Freedom* (Harper, 1951)
 Louis A. Radelet, "The Brotherhood of Man, One Catholic Viewpoint," *The Catholic World*, June 1953.
Religion and the Modern World, A symposium, (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941)
 Willard Sperry, (Editor), *Religion and Our Divided Denominations* (Harvard University Press, 1945)
 Stanley E. Stuber, *Primer on Roman Catholicism for Protestants* (Association Press, 1953)
The Religions of Democracy, (Devin-Adair, 1943)

Victor R. Yanitelli, *A Church-State Anthology. The Work of Father Murray* (Thought, Spring, 1952)

6. GROUP DIVERSITY VS. NATIONAL UNITY

Carl L. Becker, *Freedom and Responsibility in the American Way of Life* (Knopf, 1945)

Isaac B. Berkson, *Theories of Americanization* (Columbia University Press, 1920)

Stewart G. Cole, *The Concept of Citizenship, Learning and World Peace*, a symposium, (Harper, 1948)

Stewart G. Cole and Bernard Heller, "A Preface to Religious Pluralism" (Christendom, Winter, 1944)

John Dewey, *Freedom and Culture* (Putnam, 1939)

H. P. Fairchild, *The Melting-Pot Mistake* (Little, Brown, 1926)

Horace M. Kallen, *Democracy Versus The Melting Pot* (The Nation, February 10, 1915)

R. M. MacIver (Editor), *Unity and Differences in American Life* (Harper, 1947)

Bertrand Russell, *Authority and The Individual* (Simon-Schuster, 1949)

Goodwin Watson, *Action for Unity* (Harper, 1947)

Israel Zangwill, *The Melting Pot* (Macmillan, 1923)

7. THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

Harold Benjamin, *The Cultivation of Idiosyncrasy* (Harvard University Press, 1949)

Elmer Berger, *The Jewish Dilemma* (Devin-Adair, 1945)

Norman Cousins, "Bystanders Are Not Innocent" (The Saturday Review of Literature, August 2, 1947)

Harry E. Fosdick, *On Being a Real Person* (Harper, 1943)

Buell G. Gallagher, *Color and Conscience, the Irrepressible Conflict* (Harper, 1946)

David Bryn-Jones, *The Dilemma of the Idealist* (Macmillan, 1950)

James Keller, *You Can Change the World* (American Library, 1948)

R. M. MacIver (Editor), *Group Relationship and Group Antagonisms* (Harper, 1944)

Gunnar Myrdal, *The American Dilemma, I, II*, (Harper, 1944)

Goodwin Watson, *Action for Unity* (Harper, 1947)

8. SOCIAL PREJUDICE

Nathan Ackerman and Marie Jahoda, *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder* (Harper, 1950)

T. W. Adorno and Others, *The Authoritarian Personality* (Harpers 1950)

Gordon Allport, *The ABC's of Scapegoating* (Anti-Defamation League, 1948)

Dorothy W. Baruch, *Glass House of Prejudice* (Morrow, 1946)

Bruno Bettleheim and Morris Janowitz, *Dynamics of Prejudice* (Harper, 1950)

Bruno Bettleheim, *Overcoming Prejudice* (Science Research Associates, 1952)

Stewart G. Cole, *An Intergroup Self-Rating Scale* (Reprint, *Journal of the National Ethnical Association*, 1949)

John Dollard and Others, *Frustration and Aggression* (Yale University Press, 1939)

S. Andhil Fineberg, *Punishment Without Crime: What You Can Do About Prejudice* (Doubleday, 1949)

Isaque Graeber and S. H. Britt (Editors), *Jews in a Gentile World* (Macmillan, 1942)

Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts* (Harper, 1948)

Leo Lowenthal and Herbert Guterman, *Prophets of Deceit* (Harper, 1949)

Casey McWilliams, *Prejudice: Japanese-Americans, Symbol of Racial Intolerance* (Little, Brown, 1944)

Bucklin Moon, *The High Cost of Prejudice* (Messner, 1947)

Writers War Board, *How Writers Perpetuate Stereotypes*, (pamphlet), (1949)

Robin M. Williams, Jr. *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (Racial Science Research Council, 1947)

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION STANDING COMMITTEES

CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES

EDITORIAL — Leonard A. Stidley, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.

HIGHER EDUCATION — Edward W. Blakeman, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SAMUEL P. FRANKLIN, University of Pittsburgh, Chairman.

LAWRENCE C. LITTLE, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EARL A. DIMMICK, Superintendent of Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THOMAS J. QUIGLEY, Superintendent of Roman Catholic Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.

SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

O. M. WALTON, Executive Secretary, Council of Churches, Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN L. KNIGHT, President, Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio.

PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 50th ANNIVERSARY

F. ERNEST JOHNSON, Central Department of Research and Survey of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York City, Chairman.

HUGH HARTSHORNE, Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

EDNA BAXTER, Hartford School of Religious Education, Hartford, Conn.

LEO HONOR, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Penn.

ISRAEL S. CHIPKIN, Vice-President for Research and Experimentation, Jewish Education Committee of New York City.

PHILIP JONES, Associate Director, World Council of Christian Education and Sunday School Associations, New York City.

WILLIAM H. CONLEY, Vice-President, Seaton Hall University College, Newark, N. J.

OSCAR LEE, Director of the Dept. of Racial and Cultural Relations, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York City.

FRANCIS CROWLEY, Dean, School of Education, Fordham University, New York City.

PAUL B. MAVES, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

GEORGE B. FORD, Pastor, Corpus Christi Church, New York City.

ERNEST O. MELBY, Dean, School of Education, New York University.

BUELL G. GALLAGHER, President of the College of the City of New York, New York City.

CYRIL F. MEYER, Brooklyn, New York.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Executive Director, Commission of Jewish Education, The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York City.

ABRAHAM E. MILLGRAM, Executive Director, United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

FRANK GREBE, Minister of Education, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN, St. Vladimir's Seminary, New York City.

SIMON GREENBERG, Vice Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York City.

LOUIS J. SHERRILL, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER, President, Hunter College, New York City.

ISRAEL TABAK, Chairman of the Commission on Education of the Rabbinical Council of America, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

For list of members of this committee see the inside front cover.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT — Samuel P. Franklin, Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh.

RECORDING SECRETARY — O. M. Walton, Executive Secretary, Council of Churches, Pittsburgh, Pa.

TREASURER — Glenn Garbutt, New York City.

VICE-PRESIDENTS — David R. Hunter, Director, Department of Christian Education National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Emanuel Gamoran, Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

Thomas J. Quigley, Superintendent of Roman Catholic Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Edna L. Acheson — First Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

Edna M. Baxter — School of Religious Education, Hartford, Conn.

Elsie Bush — Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Ernest Chave — Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Israel S. Chipkin — Vice President, Jewish Education Committee, New York City.

Stewart G. Cole — National Conference of Christians and Jews, Los Angeles, Calif.

Alvin J. Cooper — Board of Education of the United Church of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Wesner Fallaw — Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Mass.

George B. Ford — Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church, New York City.

George Fox — Rabbi, South Shore Temple, Chicago, Ill.

Solomon B. Freehof — Rabbi, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Roma Gans — Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

Roland B. Gittlesohn — Rabbi, Rockville Centre, L. I.

Frank Grebe — Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Mildred J. Greene — Director of Religious Education, Presbyterian Church, Madison, N. J.

Hugh Hartshorne — Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Vasile Hategan — Roumanian Orthodox Church, New York City.

Ivar Hellstrom — Riverside Church, New York City.

Charles E. Hendry — University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Leo L. Honor — Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Walter Howlett — Greater New York Committee on Released Time, New York City.

F. Ernest Johnson — Division of Research and Survey, N.C.C.C. in the U.S.A., New York City.

Henry M. Johnson — Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

Gerald E. Knoff — Division of Christian Education, N.C.C.C. in the U.S.A., Chicago, Ill.

Paul M. Limbert — Executive Secretary World's Committee of the Y. M. C. A., New York City.

Imogene M. McPherson — Protestant Council of the City of New York.

Donald M. Maynard — School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Judah Pilch — Executive Director, American Association for Jewish Education, New York City.

Erwin Shaver, Division of Christian Education, N.C.C.C. in the U.S.A., Chicago, Ill.

George N. Shuster — President, Hunter College, New York City.

Ross Snyder — Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

(Area Chairmen)

New England — Ernest W. Kuebler, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.

Tri-State — Lawrence C. Little, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Southeast — Myron T. Hopper, College of Bible, Lexington, Ky.

Lake Michigan — Leon Fram, Rabbi, Temple Israel, Detroit, 2.

Southwest-Rocky Mountain — James Seehorn Seneker, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Pacific — Paul Irwin, School of Religion, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

(The Officers, Standing Committee Chairmen and the Regional Directors are also Members of Board of Directors)